

FILE

DESCRIPTION

NEWARK

FILE

SUBJECT J.R. Oppenheimer

FILE NO. 100-31936-B

VOLUME NO. _____

SERIALS 1

thru

90

NOTICE

THE BEST COPIES OBTAINABLE ARE INCLUDED IN THE REPRODUCTION OF THE FILE. PAGES INCLUDED THAT ARE BLURRED, LIGHT OR OTHERWISE DIFFICULT TO READ ARE THE RESULT OF THE CONDITION AND OR COLOR OF THE ORIGINALS PROVIDED. THESE ARE THE BEST COPIES AVAILABLE.

NEWARK FILES

REVIEWED BY CWFile No: 100-31936 "B"Re: J. Robert OppenheimerDate: 3/78
(month/year)

Serial	Date	Description (Type of communication, to, from)	No. of Pages		Exemptions used or, to whom referred (Identify statute if (b)(3) cited)
			Actual	Released	
1	4-14-54	SA memo to SAC	1	1	
		(copy of above)			
1	4-14-54	SA memo to SAC	1	1	1 DUP. NO CHARGE
		newsclip			
2	4-14-54	Newark Evening News	1	1	
		newsclip			
3	4-13-54	Jersey Journal	1	1	
		newsclip			
4	4-13-54	Newark Evening News	1	1	
		newsclip			
5	4-13-54	Newark Evening News	1	1	
		newsclip			
6	4-14-54	Jersey Journal	1	1	
		newsclip			
7	4-14-54	Newark Star Ledger	1	1	
		newsclip			
8	4-15-54	Newark Evening News	1	1	
		newsclip			
9	4-15-54	Newark Evening News	1	1	
		newsclip			
10	4-14-54	Jersey Journal	1	1	
		newsclip			
11	4-15-54	Newark Star Ledger	1	1	

File No: 100-31936 "B"Re: J. Robert OppenheimerDate: 3/78
(month/year)

Serial	Date	Description (Type of communication, to, from)	No. of Pages		Exemptions used or, to whom referred (Identify statute if (b)(3) cited)
			Actual	Released	
12	4-19-54	newsclip Newark Evening News	1	1	
13	4-13-54	newsclip Newark Star Ledger	1	1	
14	4-13-54	newsclip New York Times	1	1	
15	4-13-54	newsclip New York Times	1	1	
16	4-13-54	newsclip New York Times	5	5	
17	4-13-54	newsclip New York Times	12	12	
18	4-14-54	newsclip New York Herald Tribune	1	1	
19	4-14-54	newsclip New York Herald Tribune	1	1	
20	no date	newsclip New York Herald Tribune	1	1	
21	4-13-54	newsclip New York Times	2	2	
22	4-13-54	newsclip New York Daily News	6	6	
23	4-19-54	newsclip Newark Star Ledger	3	3	

File No: 100-31936 "B"Re: J. Robert OppenheimerDate: 3/78
(month/year)

Serial	Date	Description (Type of communication, to, from)	No. of Pages		Exemptions used or, to whom referred (Identify statute if (b)(3) cited)
			Actual	Released	
24	4-18-54	newscip Newark Sunday News	1	1	
25	4-18-54	newscip Sunday Star Ledger	1	1	
26	4-23-54	newscip Newark Star Ledger	1	1	
27	4-23-54	newscip Newark Evening News	1	1	
28	5-7-54	newscip Newark Star Ledger	1	1	
29	5-10-54	newscip Newark Star Ledger	1	1	
30	5-16-54	newscip Newark Sunday News	1	1	
31	6-2-54	newscip Newark Star Ledger	2	2	
32	6-2-54	newscip Newark Evening News	1	1	
33	6-2-54	newscip Jersey Journal	1	1	
34	6-2-54	newscip Newark Evening News	1	1	
35	6-2-54	newscip Newark Evening News	2	2	

File No: 100-31936-BRe: J. Robert OppenheimerDate: 3/78
(month/year)

Serial	Date	Description (Type of communication, to, from)	No. of Pages		Exemptions used or, to whom referred (Identify statute if (b)(3) cited)
			Actual	Released	
36	6-3-54	newsclip Newark Star Ledger	1	1	
37	6-3-54	newsclip Newark Evening News	1	1	
38	6-4-54	newsclip Newark Evening News	1	1	
39	6-4-54	newsclip Newark Star Ledger	1	1	
40	6-3-54	newsclip Trenton Evening Times	1	1	
41	6-9-54	newsclip Jersey Journal	1	1	
42	6-14-54	newsclip Newark Evening News	1	1	
43	6-16-54	newsclip Newark Star Ledger	2	2	
44	6-16-54	newsclip Newark Evening News	1	1	
45	6-16-54	newsclip Newark Evening News	2	2	
46	6-16-54	newsclip Jersey Journal	1	1	
47	6-17-54	newsclip Newark Star Ledger	1	1	

NEWARK FILES

REVIEWED BY CWFile No: 100-31936-8 Re: J. Robert OppenheimerDate: 3/78
(month/year)

Serial	Date	Description (Type of communication, to, from)	No. of Pages		Exemptions used or, to whom referred (Identify statute if (b)(3) cited)
			Actual	Released	
48	6-9-54	newsclip Newark Star Ledger	1	1	
49	6-7-54	newsclip Woodbury Daily Times	1	1	
50	6-7-54	newsclip Newark Evening News	1	1	
51	6-8-54	newsclip Newark Star Ledger	1	1	
52	6-17-54	newsclip Newark Evening News	1	1	
53	6-30-54	newsclip Jersey Journal	1	1	
54	6-30-54	newsclip Newark Evening News	2	2	
55	6-30-54	newsclip Newark Star Ledger	2	2	
56	7-1-54	newsclip Jersey Journal	1	1	
57	7-1-54	newsclip Newark Evening News	1	1	
58	7-1-54	newsclip Newark Evening News	1	1	
59	7-1-54	newsclip Newark Star Ledger	1	1	

File No: 100-31936 "B"Re: Dr. Robert OppenheimerDate: 3/78
(month/year)

Serial	Date	Description (Type of communication, to, from)	No. of Pages		Exemptions used or, to whom referred (Identify statute if (b)(3) cited)
			Actual	Released	
60	7-1-54	newscip Newark Star Ledger	1	1	
61	6-30-54	newscip Trenton Evening Times	2	2	
62	5-21-54	newscip Newark Star Ledger	1	1	
63	5-7-54	newscip The Trentonian	1	1	
64	7-4-54	newscip Sunday Star Ledger	1	1	
65	4-30-54	clipping U. S. News + World Report	3	3	
66	7-1-54	newscip New York Herald Tribune	1	1	
67	7-1-54	newscip New York Herald Tribune	2	2	
68	7-1-54	newscip New York Herald Tribune	1	1	
69	7-14-54	newscip New York Herald Tribune	1	1	
70	7-27-54	newscip Newark Star Ledger	1	1	
71	7-6-54	newscip Trenton Evening Times	1	1	

File No: 100-31936 "B" Re: J. Robert OppenheimerDate: 3/78
(month/year)

Serial	Date	Description (Type of communication, to, from)	No. of Pages		Exemptions used or, to whom referred (Identify statute if (b)(3) cited)
			Actual	Released	
72	6-28-54	newsclip Trenton Evening Times	1	1	
73	6-21-54	newsclip New York Herald Tribune	2	2	
74	7-20-54	newsclip Trenton Evening Times	1	1	
75	8-1-54	newsclip New York World- Telegram & Sun	1	1	
76	8-30-54	newsclip Newark Star Ledger	1	1	
77	8-30-54	newsclip Newark Evening News	1	1	
78	8-30-54	newsclip Bergen Evening Record	1	1	
79	8-30-54	newsclip Elizabeth Daily Journal	1	1	
80	9-23-54	newsclip Passaic Herald News	1	1	
81	9-25-54	newsclip New York Herald Tribune	2	2	
82	9-28-54	newsclip Paterson Evening News	1	1	

NEWARK FILES

REVIEWED BY CW

File No: 100-31936-B Re: J. Robert Oppenheimer

Date: 3/78
(month/year)

Serial	Date	Description (Type of communication, to, from)	No. of Pages		Exemptions used or, to whom referred (Identify statute if (b)(3) cited)
			Actual	Released	
83	10-2-54	newsclip Paterson Evening News	1	1	
84	10-2-54	newsclip Newark Evening News	1	1	
85	9-27-54	newsclip Newark Star Ledger	1	1	
86	10-22-54	newsclip Newark Evening News	1	1	
87	11-5-54	newsclip Newark Evening News	1	1	
88	11-12-54	newsclip Bergen Evening Record	1	1	
89	12-2-54	newsclip Newark Evening News	1	1	
90	1-5-55	newsclip Daily Home News	1	1	

U. S. Department of Justice

(MATERIAL MUST NOT BE REMOVED FROM OR ADDED TO THIS FILE)

Newspaper Clippings Only

FEDERAL BUREAU

of

*OK to keep
pers
5-1*

INVESTIGATION

File No. 100-31936 "B"

DO NOT DESTROY - PENDING LITIGATION

8/15/77

1

See also Nos.

100-31936-1 R330

100-31936 "A" exhibits

[Signature]
J.E. Kelly
55

Office Memorandum • UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

TO : SAC D. S. HOSTETTER

DATE: 4/14/54

FROM : SA THOMAS E. KELLY

SUBJECT: J. ROBERT OPPENHEIMER
IS - R

It is to be noted that a large number of press clippings are being accumulated in instant case. Therefore, it is suggested that a B Section of instant file be opened for the purpose of filing press clippings obtained to date and which are anticipated in the very near future.

TEK:AM
NK 100-31936

4/21/54
CCO
Prepare "B" section
to contain all newspaper
clippings
L

100-31936B-1

SEARCHED	INDEXED
SERIALIZED	FILED
APR 14 1954	
FBI - NEWARK	

Office Memorandum • UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

TO : SAC D. S. HOSTETTER

DATE: 4/14/54

FROM :

SUBJECT: SA THOMAS E. KELLY

J. ROBERT OPPENHEIMER
IS - R

It is to be noted that a large number of press clippings are being accumulated in instant case. Therefore, it is suggested that a B Section of instant file be opened for the purpose of filing press clippings obtained to date and which are anticipated in the very near future.

TEK:AM
NK 100-31936

100-31936B-1

SEARCHED <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	INDEXED <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
SERIALIZED <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	FILED <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
APR 14 1954	
FBI - NEWARK	

Condon Tells His Support

Says He Has Full Faith
in Oppenheimer and
His Labeling

Special to Newark News.

CORNING, N. Y.—Dr. Edward U. Condon, former director of the National Bureau of Standards, yesterday voiced "absolute confidence in the loyalty and integrity" of Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer.

Condon said that it was "absolutely fantastic to attribute his (Oppenheimer's) motivation to anything other than his judgment of the safety of the United States."

He also commented on a charge that Oppenheimer hired Communists or former Communists at the Los Alamos atomic laboratory during World War II. Condon, who was at Los Alamos part of that time, said that two things must be made clear:

The so-called Communists were, for the most part, in student activities and not in "full, deep involvement in conspiracy. I believe there is a distinction between campus Communism

and being an out-and-out part of a subversive conspiracy."

Security Not His Job

Oppenheimer did not have "ultimate responsibility from a security point of view." Naming then Maj. Gen. Leslie R. Groves, in charge of the atomic bomb project at the time, as an example, Condon emphasized that "responsibility must be shared with others."

Regarding Oppenheimer's opposition to the development of the hydrogen bomb, Condon asserted that "there again, if anybody is going to phony up an allegation of bad faith, all the people who took this view must share the responsibility."

Condon said "springing the case now" before Senator McC. Carthy could capitalize on it, was "a wonderful public service."

<input type="checkbox"/> SAC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S #1
<input type="checkbox"/> ASAC	<input type="checkbox"/> S #2
<input type="checkbox"/> PA	<input type="checkbox"/> S #3
<input type="checkbox"/> C #1	<input type="checkbox"/> TRAIN
<input type="checkbox"/> C #2	<input type="checkbox"/> NA
<input type="checkbox"/> C #3	<input type="checkbox"/> C. CLERK
<input type="checkbox"/> APPL	<input type="checkbox"/> S. STENO

NEWARK EVENING NEWS
Newark, New Jersey

Date 4-14-54 Page 6

SUBMITTED BY THE NEWARK FIELD DIVISION

100-319365-2

SEARCHED	INDEXED
SERIALIZED	FILED
APR 14 1954	
FBI - NEWARK	

100-319365-2

Dr. Oppenheimer Suspended

'Father' of A-Bomb Charged With Employing Communists

WASHINGTON (INS) — The Atomic Energy Commission was expected to make a formal statement today on its suspension of Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer, one of the 'fathers' of the atomic bomb.

Oppenheimer, the famed physicist who was in charge of the government's atomic bomb project at Los Alamos, N. M., in World War II, has also been denied access to all U.S. security documents, pending a review of charges that he may be a security risk.

Key charges against the brilliant scientist, which a special three-member panel is studying, are that:

1. He was a frequent asso-

ciate of Communists in the early 1940s.

2. He employed Communists or ex-Communists while he was director at Los Alamos.

3. He gave contradictory testimony when he told the FBI about his attendance at Communist Party meetings early in the war.

4. He opposed the hydrogen bomb project in 1949 when he was chairman of the AEC's 10-man general advisory committee.

5. He rejected as "traitorous" an attempt by an alleged Red to pry secret information from him for Russia, but did not report the incident until after a number of months.

At Princeton, N.J., where Oppenheimer is director of the Institute for Advanced Study, a secretary said he was out of town.

Oppenheimer was named to

head the Los Alamos project in 1943—where the first A-bombs were put together—by Lt. Gen. Leslie R. Groves, then head of the Manhattan Project.

Groves, never soft on Communism or Communists, reportedly had fully investigated the physicist's background and later testified to Oppenheimer's loyalty and integrity.

ANSWERS CHARGES

In a 43-page answer to the charges, the New York City born scientist, who will be 50 on April 22, denied he lobbied against the development of the hydrogen bomb after President Truman ordered such work to proceed. He also denied giving any secret information to any unauthorized personnel.

But Oppenheimer did not deny his past Communist associations, nor his early sympathy for certain Communist philosophic concepts.




<input type="checkbox"/> SAC	<input type="checkbox"/> S #1
<input type="checkbox"/> ASAC	<input type="checkbox"/> S #2
<input type="checkbox"/> PA	<input type="checkbox"/> S #3
<input type="checkbox"/> C #1	<input type="checkbox"/> TRAIN
<input type="checkbox"/> C #2	<input type="checkbox"/> NA
<input type="checkbox"/> C #3	<input type="checkbox"/> C. CLERK
<input type="checkbox"/> APPL	<input type="checkbox"/> S. STENO

JERSEY JOURNAL
Jersey City, N.J.

Date 4-13-54 Page 1

SUBMITTED BY THE NEWARK FIELD DIVISION



100-3/936 B-3

Scientist Is Backed by Institute

New York Staff Correspondent.

NEW YORK—Complete faith in Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer's integrity was expressed today by Herbert H. Maass, chairman of the board of trustees of the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton, N. J. Oppenheimer has served as director of the institute since September, 1947.

"I hope he will be cleared and I think he will be," Maass declared at a press conference.

Maass, who has served as a trustee of the institute since 1942, said Oppenheimer told him about the investigation two months ago. Oppenheimer said it was a serious matter and Maass asserted that he also regarded it as serious.

Loyalty Never Doubted

Oppenheimer's loyalty had never been questioned, nor had the institute's board, of which Admiral Lewis Strauss, head of the Atomic Energy Commission, is president, made any investigation of Oppenheimer. "We had no reason to question his background, since he came to us from Los Alamos as the most famous atomic scientist in the world," Maass said.

"During the war he had been the director of the Los Alamos laboratory—~~in~~ position involving

the highest responsibility and secrecy. It was there, while he was director, that the atomic bomb was developed. The use of this weapon shortened the war and saved the lives of thousands of American troops. Throughout his service with the institute we have never had any occasion to doubt his complete loyalty and sincerity."

Maass said that Oppenheimer's appointment ends when he reaches the retirement age of 68. Oppenheimer will be 50 next week.

Besides Maass and Strauss, the board of trustees comprises Senator Lehman (D., N. Y.); Lloyd K. Garrison, New York attorney, who is representing Oppenheimer in the Washington inquiry; Edward S. Greenbaum, also a New York attorney; John M. Hancock, chairman of the board of Lever Brothers; Harold K. Hochschild of Princeton, identified as a retired banker; William S. Lewis, librarian at Yale University; Harold F. Linder, identified as a State Department worker in New York; Michael Schaap, retired president of Blomington's Department Store in New York; Dr. John F. Fulton of the Yale School of Medicine; Perrin C. Galpin of New York, executive director of the Grant Foundation; Samuel D. Leidesdorf of New York; Wilmarth S. Lewis, librarian at Princeton; Harold F. Linder of New York; Sidney Y. Mitchell of New York and Lessing J. Rosenwald of Jenkintown, Pa., retired chairman of Sears, Roebuck & Co.

Admired by Einstein

Staff Correspondent.

PRINCETON—Dr. Albert Einstein, physicist whose formulas laid basic scientific groundwork for the atomic bomb, said last night that he has "the greatest respect and warmest feelings" for Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer.

"I admire him not only as a scientist but also as a man of

great human qualities," Einstein said. Einstein is a colleague of Oppenheimer on the institute staff.

Einstein was heard to comment today that "it will all pass over by tomorrow," presumably a reference to attention to the Oppenheimer case.

Oppenheimer himself could not be reached for comment. His secretary implied he is in Washington, where hearings are in progress on his security file. Mrs. Oppenheimer apparently also was away from Princeton.

Manager Praises

Minot C. Morgan Jr., general manager of the institute and former Mayor of Princeton, expressed "unlimited confidence" in Oppenheimer "as a person and as a citizen of the United States." He said Oppenheimer is extremely well liked at the institute.

Mrs. Wilder Hobson, a member of Oppenheimer's staff, expressed full confidence in and enthusiastic support for the scientist.

At Princeton University, which is not connected with the institute, Dr. Eugene P. Wigner, professor of physics, said he does not work with Oppenheimer but knows him and has "complete confidence" in his loyalty. Wigner said he was "very much taken aback" at the suspension. Dr. Wigner is a member of the general advisory committee to the Atomic Energy Commission.

Graham Concur

Dr. George A. Graham, professor of politics at the university, echoed Wigner's sentiments, expressed confidence in Oppenheimer and said he had great respect for him.

Dr. Henry De Wolf Smythe, former chairman of the physics department at Princeton University and presently on leave while serving as a member of the Atomic Energy Commission, said in Washington last night that as an AEC member he would refrain from commenting until he is certain of the facts.

NEWARK EVENING NEWS
Newark, New Jersey

Date 4-13-54 Page 1

SUBMITTED BY THE NEWARK FIELD DIVISION

<input type="checkbox"/> SAC	<input type="checkbox"/> S #1
<input type="checkbox"/> ASAC	<input type="checkbox"/> S #
<input type="checkbox"/> FA	<input type="checkbox"/> S #
<input type="checkbox"/> C #1	<input type="checkbox"/> TI
<input type="checkbox"/> C #2	<input type="checkbox"/> N
<input type="checkbox"/> C #3	<input type="checkbox"/> C
SEARCHED	INDEXED
SERIALIZED	FILED
APR 13 1954	

Oppenheimer Top Scientist

Led in Making First A-Bomb

Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer, since 1947 director of the Institute for Advanced Studies at Princeton, has long been recognized as one of the world's leading theoretical scientists. It was Dr. Oppenheimer who organized and directed the atomic laboratory at Los Alamos, New Mexico, where the first atomic bomb was put together and tested.

In the early part of 1943 he was placed in charge of the atomic bomb research and development project, which was under the over-all direction of Maj. Gen. Leslie R. Groves. The first bomb was exploded a little more than two years later, on July 16, 1945—the world's first man-made nuclear explosion. Oppenheimer was then 41.

The War Department credited him with "achieving the implementation of atomic energy for military purposes." He, in turn, gave the credit to the entire staff, saying his job had been to help his fellow scientists do their work.

One scientist said: "The main

decisions were made by Oppenheimer and all proved to be correct."

While he was a "little scared of what we had made," Oppenheimer said that as a scientist he had no apologies.

He contended that effective political control of atomic energy was feasible and supported a program for an internationally constituted Atomic Development Authority, which would operate and control all sources of nuclear fission power.

Oppenheimer was among the first to set forth in plain language the potentialities of atomic warfare. He warned the public that an A-bomb attack could wipe out 40,000,000 Americans. He testified before Congressional committees, spoke on the radio and from the lecture platform, and acted as an adviser to the President, the State Department and other official agencies concerned with atomic energy.

Showed Bent Early

He was born in New York on April 22, 1904, son of a German immigrant who became a wealthy textile importer. His scientific bent came to light when, at the

age of 11, he was elected a member of the New York Mineralogical Society.

He completed the four-year course at Harvard in three years, being graduated summa cum laude in 1922. He studied for a year at Cambridge University in England, took his Ph.D. degree from Göttingen University in Germany, and continued his studies as a National Research fellow and an International Education Board fellow.

Oppenheimer held fellowships at Harvard, Leyden, Zurich and the California Institute of Technology. In 1929 he joined the faculties of California Tech. at Pasadena and the University of California at Berkeley as professor of physics. There he began his research career.

At Berkeley he established a school of theoretical physics which was devoted largely to the solution of the problems involving high energy particles. Many important advances—especially in the cosmic ray field—sprang from this school. He remained on the University of California faculty until 1947.

His wife is Katherine Puening Oppenheimer. They have two

<input type="checkbox"/> SAC	<input type="checkbox"/> S #1
<input type="checkbox"/> ASAC	<input type="checkbox"/> S #2
<input type="checkbox"/> PA	<input type="checkbox"/> S #3
<input type="checkbox"/> C #1	<input type="checkbox"/> TRAIN
<input type="checkbox"/> C #2	<input type="checkbox"/> NA
<input type="checkbox"/> C #3	<input type="checkbox"/> C. CLERK
<input type="checkbox"/> APPL	<input type="checkbox"/> S. STENO

NEWARK EVENING NEWS
Newark, New Jersey

Date 4-13-54 Page 10

SUBMITTED BY THE NEWARK FIELD DIVISION

100-31936 B-5

SEARCHED INDEXED
SERIALIZED FILED
APR 13 1954
FBI - NEWARK

T. C. [Signature]

Opposed Secret Checkups

Oppenheimer Stated View On Security

WASHINGTON (AP) — Atomic scientist J. Robert Oppenheimer, facing an Atomic Energy Commission panel on security charges, once called secret investigative methods "repugnant to the American tradition of freedom."

But he said in public testimony before the Senate-House Atomic Energy Committee in 1949 that he believed the AEC had "balanced very carefully" its loyalty program and "people will stand for it."

OPPOSED SCANNING

Oppenheimer opposed proposals to require security investigations of applicants for science fellowships distributed by the AEC through the National Research Council. He did so in a letter dated May 14, 1949, to the late Senator McMahon, then Atomic Committee chairman.

Observing that those who got the fellowships would not do any secret work, Oppenheimer said it would "be contrary to all experience to suppose that only those who have held conformist political views would make the great discoveries of the future."

He said that "even if the determination of loyalty and reliability could be made by the most straightforward and satisfactory methods," he didn't think it was necessary in the granting of fellowships.

'WAIT AND SEE'

Congressional ~~groups~~, took a wait and see attitude today toward the government's suspension and investigation of Oppenheimer.

Sen. McCarthy, declining to elaborate, said he has affidavits purporting to show that Oppenheimer once was a member of the Community Party—an affiliation the scientist has categorically denied.

PRESIDENT'S ORDER

The AEC said President Eisenhower had ordered "a blank wall" placed temporarily between Oppenheimer, one of the chief developers of the atomic bomb, and secret data to which he has had access for over 10 years.

Pending the report of an AEC investigating panel headed by former Secretary of the Army Gordon Gray, Rep. W. Sterling Cole (R-N.Y.) and Sen. Hickenlooper (R-Iowa) fixed a hands-off policy for the Senate-House Atomic Energy Committee.

Former President Truman said:

"I inherited Dr. Oppenheimer. He was considered a great scientist—one of the greatest—in connection with the atomic bomb. Don't convict anybody by implication or gossip."

DENIES DISLOYALTY

Oppenheimer has admitted that in the late 1930s and early 1940s he associated with Communist Party members and married a former member, but he has denied any disloyalty or party membership himself. He continued:

"It would be foolish to suppose that a young man sympathetic to and associated with communists in his student days would by that fact alone become disloyal and a potential traitor. It is basic to science and ~~to~~ democracy that men can learn by error."

JERSEY JOURNAL
Jersey City, N.J.

Date 4-14-54 Page 1

SUBMITTED BY THE NEWARK FIELD DIVISION

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S #1	<input type="checkbox"/> S #2
<input type="checkbox"/> S #3	<input type="checkbox"/> TRAIN
<input type="checkbox"/> NA	<input type="checkbox"/> C. CLERK
<input type="checkbox"/> S. STAFF	<input type="checkbox"/> INDEXED
<input type="checkbox"/> SEARCHED	<input type="checkbox"/> FILED
APR 14 1954	
FBI - NEWARK	

100-319248-10

Physicist will win, his colleagues say

PRINCETON (U.P.)—Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer's colleagues at the Princeton Institute for Advanced Study, which he has directed for more than six years, were almost unanimous yesterday in predicting he would be cleared of pro-Communist charges.

The institute, established as a "thought factory" on the edge of Princeton, harbors some of the best "brains" in the world, including mathematician Albert Einstein.

The wizard, whose mathematical formulas paved the way for the atomic bomb Oppenheimer helped build, was one of the first to come to his colleague's support.

EINSTEIN'S PRAISE

"I can only say I have the greatest respect and warmest feelings for Dr. Oppenheimer," Einstein said. "I admire him not

only as a scientist but also as a man of great human qualities."

Princeton usually is a quiet town, as most academic centers are. But yesterday, many of its 13,000 residents were buzzing with talk about Oppenheimer's suspension by the Atomic Energy Commission.

The switchboard at the institute was flooded with calls from people asking about the case. At nearby Princeton University and Princeton Theological Seminary, students and faculty alike debated the pros and cons of the situation.

Mayor P. MacKay Sturges said he was "amazed" to read about

(Continued on Page Four)

Colleagues say physicist will clear himself

(Continued from Page One)

the case but would not comment because he did not know Oppenheimer or his family.

"Our only industry here is education," Sturges said, "but personally there are many of the intellectuals we harbor that I never come in contact with. They don't get involved in civic affairs much."

The institute is a colonial-type building where scholars and scientists pick apart just about every type of problem. About a mile from Princeton University, it is not associated with it in any way.

"The whole staff has unlimited confidence in the doctor as a man and as a citizen of the United States," said staff member Minot Morgan Jr.

Dr. Eugene P. Wigner, professor of physics at the university and a pioneer in atomic development, said the charges against Oppenheimer were "very regrettable and potentially damaging to this country's prestige."

Dr. Allen Shenstone, Toronto, Canada, an experimental physicist at the university since 1925, agreed. The questioning of Oppenheimer's loyalty is damaging to intellectuals generally and particularly to physicists, he said.

NEWARK STAR LEDGER

NEWARK, N. J.

DATE 4-11-54 PAGE 1

SUBMITTED BY THE NEWARK FIELD DIVISION

<input type="checkbox"/> SAC	<input type="checkbox"/> S #1
<input type="checkbox"/> ASAC	<input type="checkbox"/> S #2
<input type="checkbox"/> PA	<input type="checkbox"/> S #3
<input type="checkbox"/> C #1	<input type="checkbox"/> TRAIN
<input type="checkbox"/> C #2	<input type="checkbox"/> NA
<input type="checkbox"/> C #3	<input type="checkbox"/> C. CLERK
<input type="checkbox"/> APPL	<input type="checkbox"/> S. STENO

100-31936B-7

SEARCHED	INDEXED
SERIALIZED	FILED
APR 11 1954	
FBI - NEWARK	

Criticized By Condon

Oppenheimer Allegedly Was Taken to Task For 'Informing'

WASHINGTON (MS)—Top atomic scientist J. Robert Oppenheimer, under investigation as a security risk, reportedly has been accused of turning informer against a former A-bomb associate in 1949 to "buy immunity" for himself.

It was learned that a letter allegedly written to Oppenheimer by Dr. Edward U. Condon, former head of the Bureau of Standards, leveled the "informer" charge against the physicist.

Condon, once labeled "one of the weakest links" in atomic security, purportedly accused his erstwhile friend of trying to "buy immunity for yourself by turning informer" in a Congressional probe.

Oppenheimer's Student

The charge referred to Oppenheimer's secret testimony before the House un-American activities committee in 1949, when the scientist reportedly gave derogatory testimony about Dr. Bernard Peters.

Peters had been one of Oppenheimer's students in the atomic field and allegedly was identified by him as a one-time Communist.

Assistants to Senator McCarthy reportedly regard as "dynamite" Condon's letter to Oppenheimer and a second one he penned to Oppenheimer's wife.

The physicist's associates, however, are understood to consider them an aid, rather than a hindrance, to his defense.

The Condon letters—or copies of them—were reported to be in the hands of three Congressional committees.

Condon 'Shocked'

Here is the text of the letter allegedly written June 27, 1949, to Oppenheimer by Condon:

"Dear Robert:

"I have been shocked beyond description at the article which appeared in The Rochester Times-Union purporting to give an account of your testimony about Bernard Peters before the House committee on un-American activities.

"I have lost a good deal of sleep trying to figure out how you could have talked this way about a man whom you have known so long and of whom you know so well what a good physicist and good citizen he is.

"One is tempted to feel that you are so foolish as to think you can buy immunity for yourself by turning informer.

"I hope that this is not true. You know very well that once these people decide to go into your own dossier and make it public that it will make the 'revelations' that have been made so far look pretty tame.

Demanded Job for Peters

"It is hard to think how you can make amends. I hope that there is some sense in which the whole story looks all right in spite of the unfavorable excerpts.

"In that case you should make it all public. You should write at once to the president of the University of Rochester giving him full assurance that Peters is all right. If Peters loses his position at the University of Rochester as a result of your action, and if he does, it will be a result of what you have done, then it seems to me that you are under an inescapable moral obligation to offer Peters a position on the staff of the Institute for Advanced Study that is at least the equivalent of what he now has.

"I hope you will not feel that this is unwarranted interference. This is much more than a purely personal matter between Peters and yourself. You do not need to reply to this letter; if you satisfy Peters then you will have satisfied me."

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SAC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S #1
<input type="checkbox"/> ASAC	<input type="checkbox"/> S #2
<input type="checkbox"/> PA	<input type="checkbox"/> S #3
<input type="checkbox"/> C #1	<input type="checkbox"/> TRAIN
<input type="checkbox"/> C #2	<input type="checkbox"/> RA
<input type="checkbox"/> C #3	<input type="checkbox"/> C. CLERK
<input type="checkbox"/> APL	<input type="checkbox"/> S. STENO
SEARCHED	INDEXED
SERIALIZED	FILED
APR 16 1954	
FBI - NEWARK	

NEWARK EVENING NEWS
Newark, New Jersey

Date 4-15-54 Page 7

SUBMITTED BY THE NEWARK FIELD DIVISION

Planning Aid For Scientist

Lilienthal and Dean Will Testify for Oppenheimer

WASHINGTON (U)—The two former chairmen of the Atomic Energy Commission plan to testify at the security hearing for pioneer atomic scientist J. Robert Oppenheimer—both of them apparently in his behalf.

David E. Lilienthal, who headed the commission from the time it was formed in 1946 until 1950, said in a statement issued in New York last night he will testify for Oppenheimer.

Gordon Dean, who succeeded Lilienthal and served until last Summer, said he had been asked to testify by Oppenheimer's attorney. While he would not discuss what he will say, his acceptance of an invitation by the defense presumably means his testimony will be favorable to Oppenheimer.

Bush May Testify

Another prospective witness is Dr. Vannevar Bush, wartime head of the Office of Scientific Research and Development. An aide said Bush expects to testify.

In Chicago today, Dr. Harold C. Urey, Nobel Prize-winning chemist of the University of Chicago; Dr. Cyril S. Smith, director of the university's Institute of the Study of Metals, and Dr. Samuel K. Allison, director of the Institute for Nuclear Studies, defended Oppenheimer.

The hearings for Oppenheimer, suspended from access to government secrets by order of President Eisenhower, is going on in secret here. The procedure is guided by strict rules formalized by the AEC in September, 1950, in an effort to provide maximum protection for the rights of individuals and for the government's interests.

The AEC has announced only that Oppenheimer was suspended, that a hearing is in progress and

the membership of the three-man inquiry board.

For the rest, the proceedings are cloaked in secrecy and neither the AEC nor Oppenheimer's representatives have been willing to say what was going on or even where.

Scientists Confident

Expressions of confidence in Oppenheimer came yesterday from Dr. David Hill, chairman of the Federation of American Scientists, and from Dr. Howard Meyerhoff, executive director of the Scientific Manpower Commission, a group set up by eight major scientific societies.

Secretary of Defense Wilson implied yesterday that Oppenheimer had been eased out as an adviser to the armed forces last year. He said the committee on which Oppenheimer served had been abolished last July and added that was a "real smooth way" to get rid of a problem. He gave no other details, but in general comment told a news conference:

"Frankly, I have sympathy for anyone who made a mistake and then reformed. But I think they should be reformed somewhere else than in the armed services."

McCarthy Eyes Others

Wilson said he knew of no other scientist of Oppenheimer's prominence deprived of access to secrets. But he said the department is "going over everything in the present security regulations for civilians and military people as well."

In Dallas, Senator McCarthy said he has considered Oppenheimer a security risk for years, and he added: "One man in a key spot can do more damage than a thousand in little ones." The con-

nor also told newsmen he is "deeply concerned about security on new developments of the H-bomb" and said, "we've got our eyes on some other fellows besides Oppenheimer."

<input type="checkbox"/> SAC	<input type="checkbox"/> S #1
<input type="checkbox"/> ASAC	<input type="checkbox"/> S #2
<input type="checkbox"/> PA	<input type="checkbox"/> S #3
<input type="checkbox"/> C #1	<input type="checkbox"/> TRAIN
<input type="checkbox"/> C #2	<input type="checkbox"/> NA
<input type="checkbox"/> C #3	<input type="checkbox"/> C. CLERK
<input type="checkbox"/> APPL	<input type="checkbox"/> S. STENO

NEWARK EVENING NEWS
Newark, New Jersey

Date 4-15-54 Page 1

SUBMITTED BY THE NEWARK FIELD DIVISION

SEARCHED	INDEXED
SERIALIZED	FILED
APR 15 1954	
FBI - NEWARK	

Oppenheimer Gets Dem Aid

WASHINGTON (INS)—The super-secret probe into security risk charges against top atomic scientist J. Robert Oppenheimer continued today while Democrats on Capitol Hill considered a counterblast against the administration's handling of the case.

Oppenheimer, who supervised the making of the first atomic bomb and is rated as one of the world's leading authorities on nuclear physics, was understood to be under fire because he opposed the H-bomb program when it was first proposed several years ago.

CONDON LETTERS

Informed sources said letters written to Oppenheimer and his wife by Dr. Edward U. Condon, former head of the Bureau of Standards, figure as important documents in the case.

Condon, once labeled "one of the weakest links" in atomic security, purportedly accused his erstwhile friend of trying to "buy immunity for yourself by turning informer" in a congressional probe.

Secret hearings on 16 alleged security-risk counts against Oppenheimer are being held by a special panel headed by Gordon Gray, former Army secretary.

"WRONG GUESS"

A top Democratic source declared that the new charges against Oppenheimer were based "only on the fact that he made a wrong guess."

This source insisted that other charges against the top physicist — including his reported Communist sympathies in the 1930's — had already been fully investigated, and that the new probe was based on his opposition to the H-bomb project.

<input type="checkbox"/> SAC	<input type="checkbox"/> S #1
<input type="checkbox"/> ASAC	<input type="checkbox"/> S #2
<input type="checkbox"/> PA	<input type="checkbox"/> S #3
<input type="checkbox"/> C #1	<input type="checkbox"/> TRAIN
<input type="checkbox"/> C #2	<input type="checkbox"/> NA
<input type="checkbox"/> C #3	<input type="checkbox"/> C. CLERK
<input type="checkbox"/> APPL	<input type="checkbox"/> S. STENO

JERSEY JOURNAL
Jersey City, N.J.

Date 4-14-54 Page 1

SUBMITTED BY THE NEWARK FIELD DIVISION

100-319368-10

SEARCHED	INDEXED
SERIALIZED	FILED
APR 15 1954	
FBI - NEWARK	

Oppenheimer calls former AEC heads

WASHINGTON (AP)—The two former chairmen of the Atomic Energy Commission, David E. Lilienthal and Gordon Dean, will be witnesses for the defense in security hearings for atom scientist J. Robert Oppenheimer.

Lilienthal, who headed the commission from its start in 1946, said in a statement from his New York office that he would testify in Oppenheimer's behalf.

Dean, who succeeded Lilienthal in 1950, after serving as an AEC commissioner for a year said only that he had been asked to testify by Oppenheimer's attorney and had agreed.

Disclosure that Lilienthal and Dean would testify came as Secretary of Defense Wilson indicated Oppenheimer, the scientific chief of the World War II atomic bomb project, was eased out as an adviser to the armed forces last July.

AEC announced Tuesday that—by order of President Eisenhower—it has barred Oppenheimer from access to secret data and has suspended him as one of the nation's foremost atomic consultants pending a new security check.

FBI GATHERED DATA

One allegation cited by the commission, on the basis of information gathered by the FBI from undisclosed sources, is that Oppenheimer obstructed American development of the hydrogen bomb. Oppenheimer has said this is a distortion of his real position.

FORMER SUPPORTER

Dean was AEC chairman when previous questions about Oppenheimer's admitted past connection with Communists and other left-wingers were raised, and he took no action reflecting on Oppenheimer. A new security check for the physicist was ordered, however, immediately after Lewis L. Strauss succeeded Dean in the post last July.

Wilson was asked about Oppenheimer at a news conference yesterday. After declining at first to discuss the case, he said:

"I am not trying to hurt or smear anybody who has been trying to do a good job for the country."

REFORM ELSEWHERE

"Frankly, I have sympathy for anyone who made a mistake and then reformed. But I think they should be reformed somewhere else than in the armed services."

This led to a question whether Oppenheimer still is a consultant to the Defense Department or any of the armed forces.

Wilson said Oppenheimer was a member of the Atomic Energy Committee for the department's research and development board.

But he said that commission was abolished last July, under a general reorganization, and he added with a grin that doing away with it was a "real smooth way" of getting rid of a problem. He gave no further details.

It was about the time the committee was abolished that Strauss became AEC chairman and the review of Oppenheimer's case began.

NEWARK STAR LEDGER

NEWARK, N. J.

DATE 4-15-54 PAGE 1

SUBMITTED BY THE NEWARK FIELD DIVISION

<input type="checkbox"/> SAC	<input type="checkbox"/> S #1 <u>✓</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> ASAC	<input type="checkbox"/> S #2
<input type="checkbox"/> PA	<input type="checkbox"/> S #3
<input type="checkbox"/> C #1	<input type="checkbox"/> TRAIN
<input type="checkbox"/> C #2	<input type="checkbox"/> NA
<input type="checkbox"/> C #3	<input type="checkbox"/> C. CLERK
<input type="checkbox"/> APPL	<input type="checkbox"/> S. STENO

100-37936B-11

SEARCHED	INDEXED
SERIALIZED	FILED
APR 15 1954	
FBI - NEWARK	

Views Differ On Scientist

Hickenlooper Reserves Judgment; Gore Sure Oppenheimer Loyal

WASHINGTON (AP) — Senator Hickenlooper (R., Ia.) said today the Senate-House atomic energy committee is reserving the right to act on the J. Robert Oppenheimer case but Senator Gore (D., Tenn.) said he doubts Congress should intervene.

Hickenlooper, vice chairman of the committee, said the group will await a decision by the Atomic Energy Commission on whether Oppenheimer is a security risk.

Hickenlooper said he is reserving judgment on the charges that Oppenheimer was a former associate of Communists and that he opposed making the hydrogen bomb and "slowed down its development" even after former President Truman ordered it started.

No Doubt on Loyalty

Gore said that as chairman of a House appropriations subcommittee which handled the bill providing the money for the H-bomb project he had heard all of the arguments for and against it and was familiar with the Communist associations accusations against Oppenheimer.

"So far as I am concerned, I have no doubt whatever about Dr. Oppenheimer's loyalty," Gore said. "For one who is accused of disloyalty, he has contributed remarkably well to the security and the defense of the nation."

Gore said he believes the AEC's decision ought to end the matter, adding that he does not believe Congress is "properly equipped to decide whether a man is loyal or not."

Other expressions of confidence in Oppenheimer were voiced over

the week-end by some of his scientific colleagues.

Dr. Arthur H. Compton, upon whose recommendation Oppenheimer was named in 1942 to head up preliminary atomic research, said he regarded it as an asset that Oppenheimer was no "innocent" about Communism.

In an interview in Istanbul, Turkey, Compton said he had made a careful inquiry and "I satisfied myself completely that Oppenheimer was reliable and no security risk and have had no reason since to change my views."

Suspects Moves

Sumner T. Pike, a former Atomic Energy commissioner, said on a CBS television program from New York last night:

"These things are so incredible to me that I almost wonder if there isn't some other motivation behind the apparent one in bringing these charges at this time."

The Federation of American Scientists, in a week-end statement issued by Dr. M. Stanley Livingston, head of its executive committee, said the charge against Oppenheimer "has shocked the

nation and the scientific community in particular."

Chairman Velde (R., Ill.) of the House un-American activities committee, said in reply to a question about Oppenheimer on an NBC-TV program yesterday that "I don't consider that he is a traitor." He said the committee is considering whether to make public testimony which Oppenheimer gave in secret in 1949.

<input type="checkbox"/> SAC	<input type="checkbox"/> S #1 ✓
<input type="checkbox"/> ASAC	<input type="checkbox"/> S #2
<input type="checkbox"/> PA	<input type="checkbox"/> S #3
<input type="checkbox"/> C #1	<input type="checkbox"/> TRAIN
<input type="checkbox"/> C #2	<input type="checkbox"/> NA
<input type="checkbox"/> C	<input type="checkbox"/> C. CLERK
<input type="checkbox"/> A.D.	<input type="checkbox"/> S. STENO

100-31936B-12

SEARCHED.....	INDEXED.....
SERIALIZED.....	FILED.....
APR 19 1954	
FBI - NEWARK	
J. E. [unclear]	

NEWARK EVENING NEWS
Newark, New Jersey

Date 4-19-54 Page 10

SUBMITTED BY THE NEWARK FIELD DIVISION

Report AEC suspension of Oppenheimer

NEW YORK (AP)—The New York Times says famed physicist Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer, who directed the making of the first atomic bomb, has been suspended on security grounds by the Atomic Energy Commission.

A panel of the commission's personnel security board, headed by Gordon Gray, president of the University of North Carolina and former Secretary of the Army, started hearings on the case yesterday, the Times said.

Meanwhile, the dispatch says, Oppenheimer has been denied access to all government security documents.

(At Oppenheimer's home in Princeton, a spokesman said the family was out of town.)

The New York Herald Tribune carried a similar story from Washington by Joseph and Stewart Alsop.

This story said that Sen. McCarthy "is known to have been secretly 'building a case' against Dr. Oppenheimer and other scientists since last summer."

The Alsops said Washington political observers "have no doubt" that McCarthy had the Oppenheimer charges in mind when he said last Tuesday there had been a deliberate delay of 18 months in beginning work on the hydrogen bomb project.

"McCarthy asked at that time: 'If there were no Communists in government, why did we delay?'"

DIRECTED A-PROJECT

Oppenheimer directed the atomic bomb project at Los Alamos, N. M., during World War II. He is one of the world's foremost atomic physicists.

The Times said most of the principal charges against Oppenheimer, 50, have been reviewed by the Atomic Energy Commission, the White House and the Departments of Justice, State and Defense over a period of 12 years.

The newspaper said the main charges are that he:

1. Associated frequently with Communists in the early 1940s, including his brother Frank and Frank's wife; that he fell in love with one Communist and married a former Communist and that he contributed generously to Communist causes from 1940 to April of 1942.

2. Hired Communists or former Communists at Los Alamos.

OPPOSED H-BOMB

3. Gave contradictory testimony to Federal Bureau of Investigation about attendance at Communist meetings in the early 1940s.

4. Rejected as "traitorous" an attempt by an alleged Communist to get scientific information from him for the Soviet Union, but failed to report the incident to the government's security officers for many months.

5. Strongly opposed development of the hydrogen bomb in 1949 when he was chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission's general advisory committee, and lobbied against it, even after former President Truman ordered the AEC to proceed with the project.

Oppenheimer, described as a

(Continued on Page Five)

Oppenheimer hearings on

(Continued from Page One)

sensitive, soft-spoken man, has admitted association with various Communists in the late 1930s and early 1940s. He has flatly denied, however, that he was a member of the Communist Party.

Oppenheimer lives with his wife and two small children on the grounds of the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton, N. J. He is a director of the institute.

In addition to his work at Princeton, he was, until his suspension, a member of President Eisenhower's Science Advisory Committee and consultant to the Atomic Energy Commission. He was also adviser to the departments of State, Defense and the National Security Council on armaments and their regulation, continental defense, civil defense and the use of atomic weapons in support of ground combat.

The Times said that in a 43-page answer to the charges, Oppenheimer claimed he lobbied against the hydrogen bomb after President Truman had ordered its development or that he gave any secret information to any unauthorized persons.

He did not deny his past Communist associations, the story said, but "asserted that he had abandoned his illusions about communism during the war. Finally, he asked that the 'derogatory information' in his file be judged in the context of his strange life and work."

NEWARK STAR LEDGER

NEWARK, N. J.

DATE 4-13-54 PAGE 1

SUBMITTED BY THE NEWARK FIELD DIVISION

100-319368-13

SEARCHED	INDEXED
SERIALIZED	FILED
APR 13 1954	

QUERTES SPEAR ISSUE OF LOYALTY

Was There Deliberate Delay
in H-Bomb, and, If So, Was
Oppenheimer Concerned?

Special to The New York Times
WASHINGTON, April 17—At
the heart of the Oppenheimer
row are two unanswered ques-
tions:

Was there in fact a deliberate
delay in United States efforts to
develop a hydrogen bomb—a de-
lay that went beyond the four-
month period of high-level discus-
sion before President Truman's
go-ahead order on Jan. 31, 1950?
If there was such a delay, what
part, if any, did Dr. J. Robert
Oppenheimer play in it?

The Atomic Energy Commis-
sion, in suspending Dr. Oppen-
heimer's security clearance last
Dec. 23, gave fresh currency to
some familiar charges about his
associations in California before
he had taken charge of the
atomic bomb project at Los Al-
amos, N. M., in World War II.
The nuclear physicist did not
deny most of these associations in
his reply to the commission's
charges.

The fresh charges have to do
with Dr. Oppenheimer's part in
the hydrogen-bomb program as
Chairman of the General Advi-
sory Committee to the Atomic
Energy Commission, a group of
scientists and engineers that un-
animously recommended against
the hydrogen-bomb project in
October, 1949.

Development Slowed

The A. E. C. statement of
charges was made over the sig-
nature of Maj. Gen. Kenneth D.
Nichols, General Manager of the
agency. In it, Dr. Oppenheimer
is depicted as the leader of a
calculated movement in opposi-
tion to the hydrogen-bomb
program even after President
Truman had decided, as a matter
of high national policy, to go
ahead with it. This opposition
movement, Mr. Nichols wrote,
"has definitely slowed down" the
hydrogen-bomb development.

He specifically accused Dr.
Oppenheimer of:

① Departing from his "proper
role" as an adviser to A. E. C.
by causing the advisory com-
mittee's adverse report to be
circulated among scientists at
Los Alamos laboratory "for the
purpose of trying to turn such
loyal personnel against the devel-
opment of the hydrogen bomb."

② Persuading other outstanding
scientists not to work on the
hydrogen project and declining
to cooperate fully himself.

③ Three accusations Dr. Oppen-
heimer has denied without equi-
vocation.

"I never urged anyone not to
work on the hydrogen bomb de-
velopment," he wrote. "I never
made nor caused any distribution
of the A. E. C. reports except to
the commission itself."

④ About Mr. Truman had made
a decision, Dr. Oppenheimer
said, the advisory

"never again raised the question
of the wisdom of the policy
which had now been settled, but
concerned ourselves rather with
trying to help implement it."

Whether the hydrogen program
was delayed after Mr. Truman
received the debate on the wis-
dom and feasibility of an accel-
erated effort has not been deter-
mined officially.

President Eisenhower said last
week that he had no knowledge
of such a delay, that the matter
had never been mentioned to him
by Rear Admiral Lewis L.
Strauss, Chairman of the Atomic
Energy Commission.

Mr. Truman declared emphat-
ically there had been no
delay, that his order had been
issued as soon as the scientists
were "ready to go to work."

Senator Joseph R. McCarthy,
on the other hand, has spoken of
an "eighteen-month deliberate
delay," which he attributed to
the influence of traitors in the
Government. The Wisconsin Re-
publican so far has not made
clear what period he was talking
about, nor whom he held respon-
sible for the delay.

Apart from Dr. Oppenheimer,
the members of the advisory
committee at the time of the
hydrogen bomb debate were:

Hartley Rowe, chief engineer
and vice president of the United
Fruit Company; James E. Conant,
then president of Harvard Uni-
versity and now United States
High Commissioner in Germany;
Enrico Fermi, nuclear physicist
at the University of Chicago; Ol-
iver Buckley, then board chairman
of the Bell Telephone Labora-
tories.

And Dr. Lee A. DuBridge, pre-
sident of the California Institute
of Technology; Dr. Cyril Smith
of the University of Chicago; Dr.
I. I. Rabi of Columbia University,
and Dr. Glenn Seaborg of the
University of California.

Opinions Held 'Anonymous'

Dr. Seaborg, who was abroad
at the time, missed the special
meetings Oct. 29 and 30, 1949, at
which the advisory group con-
sidered the advisability of the
hydrogen project. The other eight
members, Dr. Oppenheimer re-
called, were unanimous in oppos-
ing a "crash program" out of a
common conviction that such an
effort might weaken rather than
strengthen the position of the
United States.

Their objection was elaborated
by David E. Lilienthal, then
Chairman of the Atomic Energy
Commission, writing in The New
York Times Magazine last Oct.
6. Mr. Lilienthal told how the
hydrogen bomb proposal had
been offered as a counter to the
Soviet Union's ther-
monuclear success in at-
tomic explosion in 1951.

Among the officials the
skeptical military per-
sonnel were
Mr. [illegible]

recommended a policy. The other
members were Mr. Johnson, who
strongly advocated the hydrogen
bomb investment, and Dean Aches-
on, the Secretary of State.

This group met at noon on Jan.
31, 1950, with Mr. Truman Sec-
retaries Johnson and Acheson
voiced for the hydrogen project,
Mr. Lilienthal against.

The President, a few hours
later, closed the four-month de-
bate by announcing to the world
that he had ordered the Atomic
Energy Commission to go for-
ward with the project.

Dr. Oppenheimer, in his reply
to the A. E. C. charges, acknowl-
edged that the General Advisory
Committee had expressed the
view three months earlier that
"an imaginative and concerted
attack on the problem has a bet-
ter than even change of produc-
ing the (hydrogen) weapon with-
in five years."

This optimistic view was sup-
planted soon afterward by a more
pessimistic one based on "later
calculations and measurements"
made at Los Alamos.

"Still later, brilliant inventions
led to the possibility of those of
development of very great
promise," he declared.

Making no claim to omniscience
while asserting that the group
had acted in good faith, Dr. Op-
penheimer said:

"At each stage the General Ad-
visory Committee and I as its
chairman and as a member of
other bodies reported as faith-
fully as we could our evaluation
of what was likely to fail and
what was likely to work."

The New York Times
April 13, 1954

100-31936014

SEARCHED	INDEXED
SERIALIZED	FILED
APR 16 1954	
FBI - NEWARK	

T. Kelly

SCIENTIST UPHELD DESPITE F. B. I. FILE

Warning to Lillenthal in 1947
Was Studied by Atom Unit
and Sent to President

Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, April 13 — One evening early in March, 1947, David E. Lillenthal, then chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, received a telephone call at home from J. Edgar Hoover, director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Mr. Hoover said he hoped Mr. Lillenthal would give his personal attention to a special report that would reach him soon. The report concerned one of the commission's chief advisers.

The report arrived on Saturday, March 8. It was a file on Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer.

On the following Monday morning, Mr. Lillenthal called members of the commission to his office, then in the present State Department Building. The commissioners examined the file, which contained material relating to Dr. Oppenheimer's associations during the Nineteen Thirties with Communists and pro-Communists.

Later in the day, after some telephoning, the commission met with Dr. Vannoy Bush and Dr. James E. Conant, then president of Harvard University. It was the recollection of at least some of those present that both men said they had known of Dr. Oppenheimer's past associations, but that he had proved himself loyal and patriotic and there was nothing to fear.

Nevertheless, since Dr. Oppenheimer, as chairman of the commission's General Advisory Committee, was a Presidential appointee, it was decided that President Truman should be notified of the F. B. I. report.

The report also was discussed with members of the Military Liaison Committee on Atomic Energy and with two members of the Senate, Brien McMahon, Democrat of Connecticut, and Bourke H. Hickenlooper, Republican of Iowa. To all of these, apparently, Dr. Oppenheimer's loyalty was an accepted fact. Maj. Gen. Leslie R. Groves, the Army officer in charge of the bomb project, attested to his belief in the scientist's loyalty.

A short time later, Mr. Hoover communicated to certain officials his belief that Dr. Oppenheimer should have reported more promptly that he had been solicited by a friend (a Mr. Chevalier) to deliver classified information.

In the fall of 1949, a weapons development and expansion program was under consideration. The General Advisory Committee under Dr. Oppenheimer's chairmanship strongly favored the program.

H-Bomb Study Pushed

About that time, the question of exploring the possibility of a hydrogen bomb came up. This had been stimulated by the knowledge that the Russians had just achieved their first atomic explosion.

The General Advisory Committee, still headed by Dr. Oppenheimer, was summoned to meet

in Washington on Oct. 30 and 31, 1949, to discuss the "super bomb" proposal. The military chiefs sat in on one of these meetings and, as some observers reported, they expressed no significant conviction about the value of such a bomb.

On Oct. 30, 1949, the advisory committee met with the Atomic Energy Commission. Seven of the nine members of the advisory committee opposed a "super bomb" program, and two others proposed certain diplomatic steps first. The prevailing belief was that progress in the weapons program previously under discussion was more important to national security.

The views of the advisory committee were reduced to writing and transmitted to the President.

About Nov. 30, 1949, President Truman asked the National Security Council to set up a subcommittee to study the question of a "super bomb" to counter the Soviet achievement.

Mr. Lillenthal, as a member of this subcommittee, conferred a number of times with General of the Army Omar Bradley, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, on the military usefulness of a "super bomb."

On Jan. 31, 1950, President Truman made the decision to accelerate efforts to achieve the "super bomb."

The New York Times
April 13, 1954

100-319368-15

SEARCHED	INDEXED
SERIALIZED	FILED
APR 14 1954	
FBI - NEWARK	
T. Kelly	

DR. OPPENHEIMER SUSPENDED BY A.E.C. IN SECURITY REVIEW; SCIENTIST DEFENDS RECORD



Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer

*The New York Times
April 13 1954.*

100-319368-16

HEARINGS STARTED

Access to Secret Data
Denied Nuclear Expert
—Red Ties Alleged

Facts of charges and reply by
Oppenheimer, Pages 14, 17, 18.

By JAMES MORTON

Washed to the New York Times

WASHINGTON, April 13—Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer, the man who directed the making of the first atomic bomb, has been suspended by the Atomic Energy Commission pending a review of his security file.

A panel of the commission's Personnel Security Board, headed by Gordon Gray, president of the University of North Carolina and former Secretary of the Army, started hearings on the case today.

The other members of the three-man panel are Thomas Morgan, former chairman and president of the Sperry Corporation, and Ward V. Evans, Professor of Chemistry at Loyola University of Chicago.

Meanwhile Dr. Oppenheimer, who directed the Government's atomic bomb project at Los Alamos, N. M., in World War II, and now carries around in his hand as much top secret information as any man alive, has been denied access to all Government security documents.

Charges Are Listed

The main charges against him consist of which had been received by the A. E. C., the White House, and the Departments of Justice, State and Defense over a period of twelve years—were that he:

1. Associated frequently with Communists in the early Forties, including his brother Frank and Frank's wife; that he fell in love with one Communist and married another former Communist; and that he contributed regularly and generously to Communist causes from 1940 to April of 1943.

2. Employed Communists or former Communists at Los Alamos during the war.

3. Gave contradictory testimony to the Federal Bureau of Investigation about attendance at Communist meetings in the early thirties.

4. Rejected as "traitorous" an attempt by an alleged Communist to get scientific information from him for the Soviet Union, but failed to report the incident to the Government's security officers for many months.

5. Strongly opposed the development of the hydrogen bomb in 1945, when he was chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission's General Advisory Committee, and joined against it even after President Truman ordered the A. E. C. to proceed with the project.

Dr. Oppenheimer, who has repeatedly admitted association with various Communists in the late thirties and early Forties but flatly denied membership in

Continued on Page 14, Column 1

A. E. C. SUSPENDS DR. OPPENHEIMER

Continued From Page 1

The Communist party, in a crowded hall of 50 years of age. He lives with his wife and two small children in a big white apartment house on the grounds of the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton, N. J., where he is director.

In addition to his work there, he was, until his suspension, a member of President Roosevelt's Science Advisory Commission, consultant to the A. E. C., and adviser to the Department of State, Defense and the National Security Council on armaments and their vegetable, synthetic, atomic, and other uses, and the use of atomic weapons in support of ground combat.

Dr. Oppenheimer, in a forty-three-page answer to the charges against him, denies that he had been against the hydrogen bomb development after President Truman had ordered its development, or that he had given any secret information to any unauthorized person.

He did not deny his past Communist associations or his sympathy for certain philosophic objectives of Communist ideology. However he asserted that he had abandoned his interests about Communism during the war. Finally, he asked that the "degradatory information" in his file be judged in the context of his strange life and work.

Describing this life, when he was a professor at the University of California and the California Institute of Technology, Dr. Oppenheimer said:

"My friends, both in Princeton and in Berkeley, were mostly security people, communists, anarchists and artists. I studied and read Sanskrit with Arthur Ryder. I read very widely, but mostly literature, novels, plays and poetry; and I read something of other parts of science.

"I was not interested in and did not read about economics or politics. I was almost wholly divorced from the contemporary scene in this country. I never read a newspaper or a current magazine like Time or Harper's; I had no radio, no telephone; I cleared out of the stock market crash in the fall of 1929 only long after the event; the first time I ever voted was in the Presidential election of 1936."

Interest in War to Span

Dr. Oppenheimer explained to the A. E. C. that he later began to take an interest in political matters, particularly in the Republican battle against Gen. Francisco Franco in the Spanish Civil War, and that he developed many left-wing associations and contributed to the Communists for the Spanish Republic—before he came over \$100.

"Because of these associations," he said, "I might well have appeared at the time to walk close to the Communist party—perhaps even, to some people, as belonging to it. "As I have said, some of its declared objectives seemed to me desirable. But I never was a member of the Communist party. I never accepted Communist ideology or theory; in fact, it never came to me.

"I had no clearly formulated political views. I hated tyranny and repression and every form of intellectual control of thought. In poor men, I did not to them. I knew who was and who was not a member of the Communist party. No one ever asked me to join the Communist party.

The question raised about Dr. Oppenheimer's position on the hydrogen bomb was phrased by the A. E. C. letter in these terms:

"It was reported (presumably by the F. B. I.) that in the autumn of 1941, 1942 and subsequently, you strongly opposed the development of the hydrogen bomb: (1) on moral grounds; (2) by claiming that it was not feasible; (3) by claiming that there were insufficient facilities and scientific personnel to carry on its development; and (4) that it was not politically desirable."

Dr. Oppenheimer replied that he and the other members of the Science Advisory Committee of the A. E. C. had opposed the bomb because of "moral reasons" to the "expert" the scientific community for the hydrogen bomb project.

Chairman of the A. E. C. said, for example, that another attempt should be made to negotiate a world agreement for the control of atomic weapons before proceeding with "the bomb." He also thought that a decision to build the A-bomb would perpetuate what he regarded as the illusion that the bigger war was a substitute for an all-around military program, which was hampered at that time by an economy war.

Dr. Oppenheimer had any political or moral reservations about the hydrogen bomb program, however, he did not mention them in his reply to the Atomic Commission.

There are two different stories about how the Oppenheimer case was revived at that time. The first is that a former employee of the Joint (Congressional) Committee on Atomic Energy, who had opposed Dr. Oppenheimer's position on the development of the hydrogen bomb in 1942, went to the present head of the Joint Committee, Representative W. Sterling Cole, Republican of upstate New York, with a long catalogue of charges against Dr. Oppenheimer, and that Mr. Cole took up the matter with the White House.

The other, and more generally accepted version, is that the F. B. I. itself sent a summary of the charges to the Oppenheimer file to President Roosevelt and questioned the prudence of allowing a person with such Communist associations in the past to have access to top secret information.

It is understood that the President discussed the matter with the Secretary of Defense, Charles E. Wilson, the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, Arthur B. Flemming, and his assistant on National Security Council matters Gen. Robert C. Butler, before calling in Admiral Strauss, the A. E. C. chairman.

Asked to Meet Strauss

This was in December of 1953, during the controversy over how former President Truman had dealt with F. B. I. security warnings in the Harry Dexter White case. Whether this affected the decision is not known, but in any event a decision was made to proceed with the case.

Accordingly, Dr. Oppenheimer was asked to meet Admiral Strauss, who had been a member of the commission in 1947, when the Oppenheimer file was first sent to the commission by the F. B. I. The Admiral later was reported to be the chairman of Dr. Oppenheimer's review of the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton.

Admiral Strauss is understood to have given Dr. Oppenheimer the choice of resigning or facing security charges. This was on Dec. 21, 1953. Dr. Oppenheimer stated then, and wrote a letter the next day repeating, that he preferred to face the charges.

As a result, Mr. Gen. H. D. Nichols, the general manager of the Atomic Energy Commission, wrote a letter on Dec. 22, 1953, which stated the derogatory information in Dr. Oppenheimer's file and explained "the steps which you may take to assist in the resolution of this question." The letter explained that, under the Eisenhower Administration's new security regulations (Executive Order 12958), it was mandatory that a Government employee be suspended and his eligibility to use security information denied where there existed in his file "information indicating that his employment may not be clearly consistent with the interests of national security."

This particular part of the letter seemed to suggest that the review of the case was more or less routine—an automatic check of old information to make sure that it conformed to the Eisenhower Administration's new security regulations.

The Nichols letter added, however: "As a result of additional investigation as to your character, associations and loyalty . . . there has developed considerable question whether your continued employment on Atomic Energy Commission work will endanger

Pg 2

A. E. C. SUSPENDS DR. OPPENHEIMER

Continued From Page 3

The Communist party, is a danger to the development of the program.

When Admiral Louis L. Strauss, who was then on the committee but not chairman of it, had circulated a memorandum urging the development of the program as far as possible, but the General Advisory Committee took another view.

Dr. Oppenheimer did not agree with the committee, including himself, opposed the "truth" program in his letter to the A. E. C. He referred the Government to the advisory committee's report at that time.

However, it is understood that he also put in evidence another secret document in the form of a memorandum about the decision of the advisory committee at that time. According to this memorandum, Dr. Oppenheimer and several other members of the advisory committee took this view:

The view of the Soviet Government, the United States defense program was not sufficient.

More design of weapons estimated to increase the quality of atomic weapons should be present at once.

Particularly, the "Red Sea" program of the weapons should be increased.

More attention should be paid to the project for developing

atomic weapons for peace and atomic artillery. Some of the members on the advisory committee at that time it is understood Dr. Oppenheimer agreed with them—did have moral and political reasons for opposing the hydrogen bomb program.

Wanted New Negotiations

Altogether, the A. E. C.'s letter raised over twenty different questions about Dr. Oppenheimer's conduct, associations, loyalty and honesty. The committee explained to Dr. Oppenheimer that the A. E. C. was not waiting for or giving the answers of these charges, but merely passing them along to Dr. Oppenheimer to clear up.

The New York Times obtained a detailed report of these charges and sought verification from Dr. Oppenheimer, Admiral Strauss and Chairman Cole of the Congressional Atomic Energy Committee.

In view of the fact that the Times was in possession of most of the facts in the case, Dr. Oppenheimer made the statement of charges and his reply available to the Times so that the record of the case could be written from the actual documents.

Charges and Replies

Accordingly, here are the main charges which were passed on to Dr. Oppenheimer in the A. E. C.'s letter and the replies given by Dr. Oppenheimer to the committee.

QUESTION NO. 1—It was reported (presumably to the F. B. I.) that prior to April, 1942, you had contributed \$150 per month to the Communist party in the San Francisco area.

Dr. Oppenheimer's reply to this charge was that he had never contributed to the Communist party. He stated that he had been a member of the San Francisco branch of the Communist party from 1941 to 1942, but that he had never contributed to it. He also stated that he had been a member of the San Francisco branch of the Communist party from 1941 to 1942, but that he had never contributed to it.

Dr. Oppenheimer's reply to this charge was that he had never contributed to the Communist party. He stated that he had been a member of the San Francisco branch of the Communist party from 1941 to 1942, but that he had never contributed to it. He also stated that he had been a member of the San Francisco branch of the Communist party from 1941 to 1942, but that he had never contributed to it.

E. C. General Manager to Dr. Oppenheimer

Oppenheimer Won Greatest Fame As 'Man Who Built the A-Bomb'

Dr. Robert Oppenheimer, one of the most brilliant scientists America has produced, was a theoretical physicist. It was a down-to-earth project of the war-time project that brought him his greatest fame. He is known as "the man who built the atom bomb."

Started in the New York Times

WASHINGTON, April 13—Dr. Robert Oppenheimer, one of the most brilliant scientists America has produced, was a theoretical physicist. It was a down-to-earth project of the war-time project that brought him his greatest fame. He is known as "the man who built the atom bomb."

Dr. Oppenheimer came to the attention of the Atomic Energy Commission in 1942 when he was named director of the Los Alamos Laboratory in New Mexico. He was then 31 years old. He was born in New York City, the son of a German immigrant who was a successful textile manufacturer. The only record of his scientific activity was a book on the theory of the atom, published in 1927.

Atomic Energy Commission Personnel Security Board. To avail yourself of the privilege afforded you under the Atomic Energy Commission hearing procedures, you must, within thirty days, designate a representative.

If a written response is not received from you within thirty days it will be assumed that you do not wish to present any explanation for further consideration. In that event, or should you not desire to appear before the Personnel Security Board, a determination in your case will be made by me on the basis of the existing record.

I am enclosing herewith, for your information and guidance, copies of the Criteria and Procedures for Determining Eligibility for Atomic Energy Commission Security Clearance and Executive Order 12812.

This letter has been marked "Confidential" to maintain the secrecy of this matter between you and the Atomic Energy Commission. You are not permitted from making such use of this letter as you may consider appropriate.

I have instructed Mr. Wm. Mitchell, whose address is 1501 Constitution Avenue, N. W., Washington, D. C., and whose telephone number is STerling 8-3000 Extension 377, to give you whatever further detailed information you may desire with respect to the procedure to be followed in this matter.

Very truly yours,
E. C. FICKLE,
General Manager.

Enclosures
1. Criteria & Procedures
2. Executive Order 12812

Oppenheimer

I had had many invitations to university positions, one or two in Europe and perhaps two in the United States. I accepted one of the appointments as Assistant Professor at the California Institute of Technology in Pasadena, and at the University of California in Berkeley. For the coming twelve years I was to devote my time to these two institutions.

Starting with a single graduate student in my first year in Berkeley, we gradually began to build up what was to become the largest school in the country of graduate and post-doctoral study in theoretical physics, so that at times went on we came to have between a dozen and twenty people lecturing and adding to quantum theory, nuclear physics, relativistic and other modern physics. As the number of students increased, so in general did their

interests begin to change. These changes did not alter my other friendships, my relations to my physics, but they added something new. I saw doctors in retrospect more than the students for whom I was charged.

I had had a continuing, undisturbed view about the situation of Jews in Germany. I had returned there, and was later to help in organizing them and bringing them to this country.

I saw what the depression was doing to my students. Often they could get no job, or jobs which were really meaningless. And through the depression I began to understand the great depression. I began to understand how deeply political and economic events could affect man's lives. I began to feel the need to participate more fully in the life of the community. I had no experience of political conviction or experience to give the perspective in these matters.

My interests broadened. In the spring of 1934, I had been introduced by friends to Jean Talbot, the daughter of a noted professor of English at the University, and in the autumn, I began to court her, and we were close to each other. We were at least twice through the marriage in mind of ourselves as engaged.

Between 1934 and her death in 1944 I saw her very rarely. She told me about her Communist party membership; they were on again, off again affairs, and never seemed to provide for her what she was seeking. I do not believe that her interests were really political. She was a person of deep religious feeling. She loved this country and its people and its life. She was a person of many friends and many friends, a friend of many fellow travelers and Communists, will be a member of which I was later to become acquainted.

I should not give the impression that I was really because of Jean Talbot that I made left-wing friends, or felt sympathy for causes which otherwise would have seemed so remote from me. Like the loyalist cause in Spain and the organization of migratory workers, I have mentioned some of the other contributing causes. I liked the new cause of companionship, and at the same time felt that I was coming to be part of the life of my time in this country.

In 1937, my father died; a Methodist minister, when I came into an inheritance, I made a will leaving the bulk of the money to the University of California for fellowships to graduate students.

This was the era of what the Communists then called the "United Front," in which the United Front was a group of people and groups in support of humanistic objectives. Many of these objectives engaged my interest.

I contributed to the strike fund of one of the major strikes of the People's World; I contributed to the various committees and organizations which were intended to help the Spanish Loyalist cause. I was invited to help establish the Teachers' Union which included faculty and teaching assistants at the university; and school teachers of the Bay Area. I was elected secretary. My connection with the Teachers' Union continued until some time in 1941, when it disbanded our chapter.

During these same years, I began to take part in the management of the Physics Department, the selection of students and the awarding of fellowships, and in the general affairs of the Graduate School of the university, mostly through the Graduate Council, of which I was a member for some years.

I also became involved in other organizations. For perhaps a year, I was a member of the Western Council of the Democratic Union, which was concerned with evaluating information on products of interest on the West Coast. I do not recall Arthur Ralston, the national head of the Communist's Union; at least I could have met it if he made a visit to the West Coast.

I joined the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom in 1937. I then stood as a protest against what had happened to scholars and professionals in Germany.

counts began to change. These changes did not alter my other friendships, my relations to my physics, but they added something new. I saw doctors in retrospect more than the students for whom I was charged.

I had had a continuing, undisturbed view about the situation of Jews in Germany. I had returned there, and was later to help in organizing them and bringing them to this country.

I saw what the depression was doing to my students. Often they could get no job, or jobs which were really meaningless. And through the depression I began to understand the great depression. I began to understand how deeply political and economic events could affect man's lives. I began to feel the need to participate more fully in the life of the community. I had no experience of political conviction or experience to give the perspective in these matters.

My interests broadened. In the spring of 1934, I had been introduced by friends to Jean Talbot, the daughter of a noted professor of English at the University, and in the autumn, I began to court her, and we were close to each other. We were at least twice through the marriage in mind of ourselves as engaged.

Between 1934 and her death in 1944 I saw her very rarely. She told me about her Communist party membership; they were on again, off again affairs, and never seemed to provide for her what she was seeking. I do not believe that her interests were really political. She was a person of deep religious feeling. She loved this country and its people and its life. She was a person of many friends and many friends, a friend of many fellow travelers and Communists, will be a member of which I was later to become acquainted.

I should not give the impression that I was really because of Jean Talbot that I made left-wing friends, or felt sympathy for causes which otherwise would have seemed so remote from me. Like the loyalist cause in Spain and the organization of migratory workers, I have mentioned some of the other contributing causes. I liked the new cause of companionship, and at the same time felt that I was coming to be part of the life of my time in this country.

In 1937, my father died; a Methodist minister, when I came into an inheritance, I made a will leaving the bulk of the money to the University of California for fellowships to graduate students.

This was the era of what the Communists then called the "United Front," in which the United Front was a group of people and groups in support of humanistic objectives. Many of these objectives engaged my interest.

I contributed to the strike fund of one of the major strikes of the People's World; I contributed to the various committees and organizations which were intended to help the Spanish Loyalist cause. I was invited to help establish the Teachers' Union which included faculty and teaching assistants at the university; and school teachers of the Bay Area. I was elected secretary. My connection with the Teachers' Union continued until some time in 1941, when it disbanded our chapter.

During these same years, I began to take part in the management of the Physics Department, the selection of students and the awarding of fellowships, and in the general affairs of the Graduate School of the university, mostly through the Graduate Council, of which I was a member for some years.

I also became involved in other organizations. For perhaps a year, I was a member of the Western Council of the Democratic Union, which was concerned with evaluating information on products of interest on the West Coast. I do not recall Arthur Ralston, the national head of the Communist's Union; at least I could have met it if he made a visit to the West Coast.

I joined the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom in 1937. I then stood as a protest against what had happened to scholars and professionals in Germany.

...more about working with the
This letter to you may consider
my private.

I have instructed Mr. Wm.
Wilford, whose address is 1801
Constitution Avenue, N. W.,
Washington, D. C., and whose
telephone number is STurting 5-
3000, Extension 377, to give you
whatever further detailed infor-
mation you may desire with re-
spect to the procedures to be fol-
lowed in this matter.

Very truly yours,
S. S. Winstein
General Manager

- Enclosures
- 1. Criteria & Procedures
- 2. Executive Order 10450

Oppenheimer

I had had many invitations to
university positions, one or two
in Europe, and perhaps ten in
the United States. I accepted con-
current appointments as Asst.
Prof. of Technology in Penn-
sylvania and at the University of
California in Berkeley. For the
coming twelve years I was to
devote my time to these two
institutions.

Starting with a single graduate
student in my first year in Berke-
ley, we gradually began to build
up what was to become the larg-
est school in the country of
graduate and post-graduate study
in theoretical physics, so that at
times went on we came to have
between a dozen and twenty peo-
ple learning and adding to quan-
tum theory, nuclear physics, rel-
ativity and other modern physics.

As the number of students in-
creased, so in general did their
quality: the men who worked
with me during those years held
chairs in many of the great cen-
ters of physics in this country;
they have made important con-
tributions to science, and in many
cases to the atomic energy pro-
gram. Many of my students would
accompany me to Pasadena in
the spring after the Berkeley
term was over, so that we might
continue to work together.

University Life Enriched

My friends, both in Pasadena
and in Berkeley, were mostly sci-
entists, scientists, classicists
and artists. I studied and read
charmingly with Arthur Rider. I
read very widely, but mostly
classics, novels, plays and poetry.
And I read something of other
sorts of subjects. I was not in-

terested in support of human
science objectives. Many of these
objectives engaged my interest.
I contributed to the strike for
of one of the major strikes of
Bridger union. I understood I
The People's World. I contrib-
uted to the various committees
and organizations which were or-
ganized to help the Spanish Loyal-
ist cause. I was worked to in-
stall the Teacher's Union
which included faculty and teach-
ing assistants at the university
and school teachers of the Bay
Area. I was elected second
secretary. My connection with
the Teacher's Union continued
until some time in 1941, when it
disbanded our chapter.

During those same years, I be-
came to take part in the in-
agement of the Physics Depart-
ment, the selection of course
and the carrying of fellowships
and in the general affairs of the
Graduate School of the univer-
sity, mostly through the Gradu-
ate Council, of which I was
member for some years.

I also became involved in other
organizations. For perhaps
years I was a member of the
Western Council of the Com-
munist's Union, which was
concerned with evaluating infor-
mation on products of interest
on the West Coast. I do re-
member Arthur Kallin, the nation-
al head of the Communist's Union
at that time. I could have said it
if he made a visit to the West
Coast.

I joined the American Com-
mittee for Democracy and Intel-
lectual Freedom in 1937. I think
it then stood as a protest against
what had happened to intellec-
tuals and professionals in Ger-
many.

I noted in the Personnel Secu-
rity Questionnaire that I filed in
in 1941 for employment with the
Manhattan District, the very re-
sult of which was that I was
not included in the list. I do
not include espionage. I have
no recollection of the Friends
of the Chinese People, or of what
my connection with this or-
ganization was.

The statement is strengthened
by the fact that while I was not a Com-
munist, I had probably belonged
to every Communist-front orga-
nization on the West Coast which
had signed many petitions
which Communists were in-
volved.

I do not recall the statement
nor to whom I might have made
it, nor the circumstances. I

Letter to Dr. Oppenheimer

It was further reported that in the summer of 1941 and autumn

Do not index

100-379368-17
SEARCHED INDEXED
SERIALIZED FILED
APR 6 1954
FBI - NEWARK
[Handwritten signatures and initials]

Spain Republican Army. It was further reported that during the period of her association with Joseph E. Baker, your wife became a member of the Communist party.

The Communist party has been designated by the Attorney General as a subversive organization which tends to alter the form of Government of the United States by unconstitutional means, within the purview of Executive Order 9835 and Executive Order 10450.

Question Asked as a Red

It was reported that your brother Frank Friedman Oppenheimer became a member of the Communist party in 1938 and has served as a party organizer and as additional director of the Professional Section of the Communist Party in Los Angeles County.

It was further reported that your brother's wife, Jackie Oppenheimer, was a member of the Communist party in 1938, and that in August, 1944, Jackie Oppenheimer entered in the organization of the East Bay branch of the California Labor School. It was further reported that in 1945 Frank and Jackie Oppenheimer were invited to an informal reception at the Russian Consulate that this invitation was extended by the American-Russian Institute of San Francisco and was for the purpose of introducing to Russian scientists who were delegates to the United Nations Conference on International Organization being held at San Francisco at that time, and that Frank Oppenheimer accepted this invitation.

It was further reported that Frank Oppenheimer agreed to give a six-week course on "The Social Implications of Modern Scientific Development" at the California Labor School, beginning May 9, 1944. The American-Russian Institute of San Francisco and the California Labor School have been cited by the Attorney General in Communist organizations within the purview of Executive Order 9835 and Executive Order 10450.

It was reported that you have associated with members and officials of the Communist party including Isaac Fulkoff, Steve Nelson, Rudy Lombard, Kenneth May, Jack Mashey, and Thomas Adlin.

It was reported that you were

Prior to April, 1941, you had contributed \$150 per month to the Communist party in the San Francisco area, and that the last such payment was apparently made in April, 1941, immediately before your entry into the Atomic bomb project.

(B)

During the period 1943-44 various officials of the Communist party, including Dr. Macnah, Peter, organizer of the Professional Section of the Communist party, Alameda County, California; Bernadette Doyle, secretary of the Alameda County Communist party; Steve Nelson, David Adelson, Paul Finley, Jack Mashey and Katrina Randow are reported to have made statements indicating that you were then a member of the Communist party; that you could not be active in the party at that time; that your name should be removed from the party mailing list and not mentioned in any way; that you had raised the Atomic bomb question over with party members during this period, and that several years prior to 1945 you had told Steve Nelson that the Army was working on an Atomic bomb.

(C)

You stated in August of 1943 that you did not want anybody working for you on the Project who was a member of the Communist party, since "you always had a question of divided loyalty" and the discipline of the Communist party was very severe and not compatible with complete loyalty to the Project. You further stated at that time that you were referring only to present membership in the Communist party and not to people who had been members of the party.

You stated further that you knew several individuals then at Los Alamos who had been members of the Communist party. You did not, however, identify such former members of the Communist party to the appropriate authorities.

It was also reported that during the period 1943-1945 you were responsible for the employment on the Atomic bomb Project of individuals who were members of the Communist party or closely associated with activities of the Communist party, including Herbert Ross Lombard, Joseph W. Stenberg, David

and Sidney Commission. It was reported that "in that active and concerted action on the problem has a better than even chance of producing the weapon within five years."

It was further reported that in the autumn of 1943, and subsequently, you strongly opposed the development of the hydrogen bomb: (1) on moral grounds, (2) by claiming that it was not feasible, (3) by claiming that there were insufficient facilities and scientific personnel to carry on the development, and (4) that it was not politically desirable.

Opposition Reported

It was further reported that even after it was determined, as a matter of national policy, to proceed with development of a hydrogen bomb, you continued to oppose the project and declined to cooperate fully in the project. It was further reported that you departed from your proper role as an advisor to the commission by seeking the destruction, disparagement and in private, to top personnel of Los Alamos of the majority and minority reports of the General Advisory Committee on development of the hydrogen bomb for the purpose of trying to turn such top personnel against the development of the hydrogen bomb.

It was further reported that you were instrumental in persuading other outstanding scientists not to work on the hydrogen bomb project and that the opposition to the hydrogen bomb, of which you are the most ardent, most powerful and most active member, has actually slowed down the development.

In view of your access to highly sensitive classified information, and in view of these allegations which, until disproved raise questions as to your veracity, conduct and your loyalty, the Commission has no other recourse. In the discharge of its obligations to protect the national defense and security, but to suspend your clearance until the matter has been resolved.

Accordingly, your employment as Atomic Energy Commission work and your eligibility for access to Restricted Data are hereby suspended, effective immediately, pending final determination of this matter.

To assist in the resolution of this matter, you have the privilege of appearing before an

Oppenheimer Won Great Fame As 'Man Who Built the Bomb'

Wrote in the New York Times

NEW ARKINGTON, April 13.—Dr. Robert Oppenheimer is one of the most brilliant scientific Americans has produced. He is a theoretical physicist, but it was a down-to-earth project of the Manhattan Project that brought him his greatest fame. He is known as the man who built the atom bomb.

The pioneer work on fission had been done by others, but to Dr. Oppenheimer came the challenge of adapting this discovery to a weapon of awesome destruction. With great insight and administrative ability, he supervised the Manhattan Project and built the bomb that was dropped on Nagasaki in August, 1945.

Personally, he had the burden of assisting to go on there early. This was to be the payoff of a \$2,000,000,000 project that was conducted in the utmost secrecy.

As far as Dr. Oppenheimer was concerned, the mission was completed on July 16, 1945. That was the day of Trinity, the test of the world's first nuclear bomb at Alamogordo, N. M. The bomb was then 11 years old.

He was born in New York City, the son of a German immigrant who was a successful textile importer. The only record of his scientific precocity was a rank in the New York City Police Department's Athletic Club at the age of 11. He went through the Ethical Culture School and then to the Harvard College course in three years, earning one credit.

He went to Europe for graduate study—Cambridge, Göttingen, Leyden, Berlin. He picked up modern languages to add to his Latin and Greek. Later, at 20, he studied Einstein's theories to include the philosophy of the ancients.

At 21, he settled in California to do research and teach. He had professorships at California Institute of Technology in Pasadena and the University of California at Berkeley. He collected art and read and wrote poetry when he was not deep in his science.

In the mid-thirties, according to his own story, he was at a point of contact with the Communist world. The shock waves of 1939 had caused him to move to meet people who Dr. Oppenheimer had heard about it.

Later on, though, he turned his back on the Russian Civil War and associated with people who named now figure in his security case. Two women mentioned along with him had been Communists. The first died. He married the second. They have two children, Katherine and Peter.

Dr. Oppenheimer, since 1947, has been director of the Institute for Advanced Study, a research center at Princeton, N. J.

He was a continuing student during his years in Germany. I had relatives there, and was later to help in understanding them and bringing them to this country.

I saw what the experience was doing to my students. Often they could get no job or job which was wholly inadequate. And through them, I began to come to the larger servers of the great depression. I began to understand how deeply political and economic events could affect man's lives. I began to feel the need to participate more fully in the life of the community. But I had no training of political conviction or experience to give me the perspective at these matters.

After September 8, 1948, I had been introduced by friends to Jean Talbot, the daughter of a noted professor of English at the University, and in the autumn, I began to court her, and we were at least two days engaged to marriage to think of ourselves as engaged.

Between 1939 and her death in 1944 I saw her very rarely. She told me about her Communist party membership; they were at night, off again affairs, or seemed to provide her with what she was seeking. I do not believe that her interests were really political. She was a person of deep religious feeling. She loved this country and its people and its life. She was, as it turned out, a friend of many fellow travelers and Communists, with a number of whom I was later to become acquainted.

I should not give the impression that it was wholly because of Jean Talbot that I made left-wing friends, or felt sympathy for causes which Alberto would have considered remote from me, like the Loyalist cause in Spain, and the organization of migratory workers. I have mentioned some of the other contributing causes. I liked the new sense of comradeship, and at the same time felt that I was coming to be part of the life of my time and country.

In 1937, my father died; a little later, when I came into an inheritance, I made a will leaving this to the University of California for scholarships to graduate students.

This was the one of what the Communists then called the "united front," in which they joined with many anti-Communist groups in support of humanitarian objectives. Many of these objectives engaged my interest.

I contributed to the strike fund of one of the major strikes of Bridgman union; I subscribed to The People's World; I contributed to the various committees and organizations which were organized to help the Spanish Loyalist cause. I was invited to help establish the Teacher's Union, which included faculty and teaching assistants at the university and school teachers of the East Bay. I was elected recording secretary. My conviction was that the Teacher's Union continued until some time in 1941, when we disbanded our chapter.

During these same years, I began to take part in the movement of the Physics Department, the collection of courses and the awarding of fellowships and in the general affairs of the Graduate School of the university, mostly through the Graduate Council, of which I was a member for some years.

I also became involved in other organizations. For perhaps a year, I was a member of the Western Council of the Communist's Union, which was concerned with evaluating information on the products of interest in the West Coast. I do not recall Arthur Kallet, the national head of the Communist's Union; at least I would have met him if he made a visit to the West Coast.

I joined the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom in 1937. I think it then stood at a point against what had happened to intellectuals and professionals in Germany.

I had, in the Personnel Security Questionnaire that I filled in 1943 for employment with the Manhattan District, the very few political remarks: "none of which I had ever given a thought. I say on that questionnaire that I did

Don't index

Atomic Energy Commission Personnel Security Board. To avail yourself of the privilege afforded you under the Atomic Energy Commission hearing procedure, you must, within thirty days following receipt of this letter, submit to me, in writing, your reply to the information outlined above and request the opportunity to appear before the Personnel Security Board.

Should you signify your desire to appear before the Board, you will be notified of the composition of the Board and may challenge any member of it for cause. Such challenge should be submitted to me within seventy-two hours of the receipt of notice of composition of the Board.

On Counsel Provided

If no challenge is raised as to the members of the Board, you will be notified of the date and place of hearing at least forty-eight hours in advance of the date set for hearing. You may be present for the duration of the hearing, may be represented by counsel of your own choosing and present evidence in your own behalf through witnesses, or by document, or by both.

Should you elect to have a hearing of your case by the Personnel Security Board, the findings of the Board, together with its recommendations regarding your eligibility for employment in Atomic Energy Commission work, in the light of Criteria and Determining Eligibility for Atomic Energy Commission Security Clearance and the requirements of Executive Order 10450, will be submitted to me.

In the event of an adverse decision in your case by the Personnel Security Board, you will have

an opportunity to review the record made during your appearance before the Board and to request a review of your case by the Commission's Personnel Security Review Board.

If a written response is not received from you within thirty days it will be assumed that you do not wish to submit any explanation for further consideration. In that event, or should you not advise me in writing of your desire to appear before the Personnel Security Board, a determination in your case will be made by me on the basis of the existing record.

I am enclosing herewith, for your information and guidance, copies of the Criteria and Procedures for Determining Eligibility for Atomic Energy Commission Security Clearance and Executive Order 10450.

This letter has been marked "Confidential" to maintain the privacy of this matter between you and the Atomic Energy Commission. You are not precluded from making such use of this letter as you may consider appropriate.

I have instructed Mr. Wm. Mitchell, whose address is 1201 Constitution Avenue, N. W., Washington, D. C., and whose telephone number is STaring 3-3000, Extension 277, to give you whatever further detailed information you may desire with respect to the procedure to be followed in this matter.

Very truly yours,
S. D. KIRKMAN
General Manager.

1 Enclosure
1 Criteria & Procedures
1 Executive Order 10450

Reply by Dr. Oppenheimer

Gen. H. K. Nichols
General Manager
U. S. Atomic Energy Commission
Washington 25, D. C.

Dear General Nichols:

This is in answer to your letter of Dec. 23, 1943, in which the question is raised whether my continued employment as a consultant on Atomic Energy Commission work "will endanger the national defense and security and whether such continued employment is clearly consistent with the interests of the national security."

Though of course I would have no desire to retain an advisory position if my advice were not needed, I cannot ignore the question you have raised. I am deeply grateful for the suggestion that I am not fit for public service.

The Home of so-called "sensitive information" set forth in your letter cannot be fairly understood except in the context of my life and my work. This answer is in the form of a summary account of relevant aspects of my life in more or less chronological order.

I had had many invitations to university positions, one or two in Europe, and perhaps one in the United States. I accepted an appointment as Assistant Professor at the California Institute of Technology in Pasadena and at the University of California at Berkeley. For the following twelve years I was to devote my time to these two faculties.

Starting with a single graduate student in my first year in Berkeley, we gradually began to build up what was to become the largest school in the country for graduate and post-graduate study in theoretical physics, so that no time went as we came to have between a dozen and twenty people learning and adding to quantum theory, nuclear physics, relativity and other more physical sciences.

As the number of students increased, so in general did their quality: the men who worked with me during these years held chairs in many of the great universities and in this country. They have made important contributions to science, and in many cases to the atomic energy project.

Reply by Dr. Oppenheimer

Mr. Gen. H. D. Nichols
General Manager
U. S. Atomic Energy Commission
Washington 25, D. C.
Dear General Nichols:

This is in answer to your letter of Dec. 22, 1951, in which the question is raised whether my continued employment as a consultant on Atomic Energy Commission work "will endanger the common defense and security and whether such continued employment is clearly consistent with the interests of the national security."

Though of course I would have to desire to obtain an advisory position if my advice were not needed, I cannot ignore the question you have raised, nor accept the suggestion that I am unfit for public service.

The issue of so-called "discovery information" set forth in your letter cannot be fairly understood except in the context of my life and my work. That context is in the form of a summary account of relevant aspects of my life in more or less chronological order, in the course of which I shall comment on the specific items in your letter through this answer and through the hearing before the Personnel Security Board, which I hereby request. I hope to provide a fair basis upon which the questions posed by your letter may be resolved.

The Pre-War Period

I was born in New York in 1904. My father had come to this country at the age of 17 from Germany. He was a successful business man and quite active in community affairs. My mother was born in Baltimore and before her marriage was a scientist and teacher of art. I attended the Ethical Culture School and Harvard College, which I entered in 1922. I completed the work for my degree in the spring of 1925. I then left Harvard to study at Cambridge University and in Göttingen, Germany in the spring of 1927. I took my doctor's degree.

The following year I was Marshall Research Fellow at Harvard and at the California Institute of Technology. In the following year I was Fellow of the International Education Board at the University of London and at the Technical High School in Berlin.

In the spring of 1929 I returned to the United States. I was homesick for this country, and in fact I did not leave it again for over nineteen years. I had learned a great deal in my student days about the new physics. I wanted to pursue this subject, to explain it and to develop it.

I had had many invitations to university positions, one or two in Europe and perhaps ten in the United States. I accepted non-tenured appointments as Assistant Professor at the California Institute of Technology in Pasadena and at the University of California in Berkeley. For the coming twelve years I was to devote my time to these two faculties.

Starting with a single graduate student in my first year in Berkeley, we gradually began to build up what was to become the largest school in the country of graduate and post-graduate study in theoretical physics. In that time went on we came to have between a dozen and twenty people having and adding to quantum theory, nuclear physics, relativity and other modern physics.

As the number of students increased, so in general did their quality: the ones who worked with me during these years held many of the great careers of physics in this country. They have made important contributions to science, and in many cases to the atomic energy project. Many of my students would accompany me to Pasadena in the spring after the Berkeley term was over, so that we might continue to work together.

University Life Resumes

My friends, both in Pasadena and in Berkeley, were mostly faculty people, scientists, students and artists. I studied and read constantly with Arthur Eddington, read very widely but mostly classical science, plays and poetry, and I read something of other parts of science. I was not interested in and did not read about economics or politics. I was almost wholly divorced from the contemporary scene in this country.

I never read a newspaper or a current magazine like Time or Harper's. I had no radio, no telephone. I learned of the stock market crash in the fall of 1929 only long after the event. The first time I ever voted was in the Presidential election of 1932.

To many of my friends my indifference to contemporary affairs seemed bizarre, and they often shied me with being too much of a know-nothing. I was interested in man and his experience; I was deeply interested in my science; but I had no understanding of the relations of man to his society.

I spent some weeks each summer with my brother Frank at our ranch in New Mexico. There was a strong bond of affection between us. After my brother's death, my father came often, mostly in Berkeley, to visit me, and we had an intimate and close association until his death.

Beginning in late 1934, my

association with the Physics Department, the selection of courses and the awarding of fellowships, and in the general affairs of the Graduate School of the University, mostly through the Graduate Council, of which I was a member for many years.

I also became involved in other organizations. For perhaps a year I was a member of the Western Council of the Communist's Union, which was concerned with evaluating information on products of interest in the West Coast. I do not recall Arthur Eddington, the national head of the Communist's Union, at least I think have met him if he made a visit to the West Coast.

I joined the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom in 1937. I think it then stood as a protest against what had happened to intellectuals and professionals in Germany.

I voted in the Presidential Security Questionnaire that I filled out in 1942 for employment with the Manhattan District, the very first national security questionnaire I had ever filled out. I say so that questionnaires that I do not include questionnaires that I have not filled out. I have a recollection of the Friends of the Chinese People, or of what, if any, association with this organization was.

The statement is attributed to me that, while I was not a Communist, I had probably belonged to every Communist-front organization on the West Coast and had signed many petitions in which Communists were listed.

I do not recall this statement, nor do I think I might have made it, nor the circumstances. The quotation is not true. It seems clear to me that if I had anything along the lines quoted, it was a half-jocular overstatement.

The matter which most engaged my sympathies and interest was the war in Spain. This was not a matter of understanding and informed conviction. I had never been to Spain. I have a little of its literature. I have nothing of its history or politics or contemporary problems. But like a great many other Americans I was emotionally committed to the Loyalist cause.

I contributed to various organizations for Spanish relief. I went to, and helped with, many parties, lectures and the like. Even when the war in Spain was manifestly lost, these activities continued. The end of the war and the defeat of the Loyalists seemed no great sorrow.

It was probably through Spanish relief efforts that I met Dr. Thomas Addis and Rudy Lammert. As to the latter, our association never became close. As to the former, he was a distinguished medical scientist who became a friend.

Addis asked me, perhaps in the

him to the Spanish relief organizations, would go to the fighting effort, and that I would go through Communist channels. I did so reluctantly, mainly when he contacted with me, explaining the nature of the work. I gave him some \$200, probably never more than a hundred dollars, and occasionally perhaps somewhat more than that, several times during the winter. I made a small contribution during the spring term when I was in Pasadena or during the summer in New Mexico.

Later—but I do not remember the date—Adelle introduced me to Frank Polkoff, who was an Adelle associate in some way connected with the Communist party, and told me that Polkoff would from then on get in touch with me. There was need for money. She told me to reach the same day that Adelle had come before, these contributions were for specific purposes, principally the Spanish war and Spanish relief.

Sometimes I was asked for money for other purposes, the organization of migratory labor in the California valleys, for instance. I don't think it occurred to me that the contributions might be directed to purposes other than those I had intended, and that such other purposes might be evil. I did not then regard Communists as dangerous, and some of their declared objectives seemed to me desirable.

In these contributions came to me, I went to a big Spanish relief party, the day before Pearl Harbor, and the next day, as we heard the news of the outbreak of war, I decided that I had had about enough of the Spanish cause, and that there were other and more pressing crises in the world. My contributions would not have continued much longer.

Days Brother Left Party
My brother Frank married in 1938. Our relations thereafter were inevitably less intimate than before. He left me at the time—probably in 1937—that he and his wife Jackie had joined the Communist party. Over the years we saw one another at occasional parties. We still spent occasional holidays together. In 1937 or 1940 Frank and Jackie moved to Stanford in the outcome of 1941 they came to Berkeley, and Frank worked for the Radiation Laboratory. At that time he made it clear to me that he was no longer a member of the Communist party.

As to the alleged activities of Jackie and Frank in 1944, 1945 and 1946: I was not in Berkeley in 1944 and 1945; I was away most of the first half of 1946; I do not know whether these activities occurred or not, and if I had any knowledge of them at the time it would only have been very sketchy.

After Christmas of 1945 my family and I visited my brother's family for a few days during the holidays, and I remember that we were there New Year's Eve and New Year's Day in 1946. On New Year's Day people were constantly dropping in. Frank and Adelle, who were at most casual acquaintances of mine, may have been among them, but I cannot remember their being there, nor indeed do I remember any of the others who dropped in that day or what was discussed.

It was in the summer of 1946 in Pasadena that I first met my wife. She was married to Dr. Harrison, who was a friend and associate of the Talmann, Lawrence and others on the California Institute of Technology faculty. I learned of her earlier marriage to Joe Deller, and of his death fighting in Spain. He had been a Communist party official, and for a year or two during their brief marriage my wife was a Communist party member. When I met her I found in her a deep loyalty to her former husband, a complete disengagement from any political activity, and a certain disappointment and contempt that the Communist party was not in fact what she had once thought it was.

Other Berkeley of Years
My own views were also evolving. Although Sidney and Rosalyn Webb's book on Russia, which I had in 1934, and the talk that I heard at that time had predisposed me to make much of the economic progress and general level of welfare in Russia, and little of its political tyranny, my views on this were in change.

I read about the purge trials though not in full detail, and would never find a view of them

from a different, less official, point of view. I still continued to be pro-Communist, and in the summer and fall of 1934, the summer of the gatherings of apparently anti-Communist people, at which Communists, as officials of the Communist party in California, accompanied, but with success as far as we were concerned to explain what the Communists are was all about.

I was asked about the Berkeley meeting in an interview in 1944 with agents of the F. B. I. I did not then recall this meeting, and in particular did not in any way connect it with Chevrolet, about whom the agents were questioning me; hence it seemed wholly irrelevant to the matter under discussion. Later my wife reminded me that the Berkeley meeting had occurred at the house of the Chevaliers; and when I was asked about it by the F. B. I. in 1950 I told them so.

Never Was a Member
We saw a little of Kenneth May; we liked him. It would have been not unusual for us to go to a housewarming for May and his wife; neither my wife nor I, however, went a party.

Wendberg was known to me as a graduate student. Hendry I do not know. Steve Madson came a few times with his family to visit; he had befriended my wife in Paris at the time of her husband's death in Spain in 1937. Neither of us has seen him since 1941 or 1942.

Because of these associations that I have described, and the contributions mentioned earlier, I might well have appeared at the time as quite close to the Communist party—perhaps even to some people as belonging to it. As I have said, some of its declared objectives seemed to me desirable. But I never was a member of the Communist party. I never accepted Communist dogma or theory; in fact, it never made sense to me.

I had no clearly formulated political views. I hated tyranny and repression and every form of dictatorial control of thought. In most cases I did not in those days know who was and who was not a member of the Communist party. No one ever asked me to join the Communist party.

Your letter sets forth statements made in 1945-46 by persons said to be Communist party officials to the effect that I was a concealed member of the Communist party. I have no knowledge as to what these people might have said. What I do know is that I was never a member of the party, concealed or open. Even the names of some of the people mentioned are strange to me, such as Jack Manley and Katrina Randow. I don't think I met Bernadette Doyle, though I recognize her name. Frank and Adelle I met at most casually, as previously mentioned.

By the time that we moved to Los Angeles in early 1945, both as a result of my changed views and of the great pressure of my work, my participation in left-wing organizations and my association with left-wing circles had ceased and were never to be re-established.

In August, 1941, I bought Eagle Hill at Berkeley for my wife, which was the first home we had of our own. We settled down to live in it with our new baby. We had a good many friends, but little leisure. My wife was working in biology at the university.

Many of the men I had known went off to work on radar and other aspects of military research. I was not without envy of them; but it was not until my first connection with the rudimentary atomic energy enterprise that I began to see any way in which I could be of direct use.

The War Years
Now came the discovery of nuclear fission, the possibility of powerful explosives based on it had been very much in my mind, as it had in that of many other physicists. We had some understanding of what this might do for us in the war, and how much it might change the course of history.

In the summer of 1941, a special committee was set up by the National Academy of Sciences under the chairmanship of Arthur Compton to review the prospects and feasibility of the different uses of atomic energy for military purposes. I attended a meeting of this committee; this was my first official connection with the atomic energy program.

After the Academy meeting, I spent some time in preliminary consultations about the construction and performance of atomic bombs, and became increasingly excited at the prospects. At the same time I still had a

...when we were in Spain, I remember that I met my first wife, who was married to Dr. ... was a friend and ... of the ... and others on the ... Institute of Technology ... I learned of her ... to Joe Heller and ... and been a Communist party of ... and for a year or two ... their brief marriage my ... was a Communist party ... When I met her I found ... her a deep loyalty to her ... husband, a complete dis ... from any political ... and a certain dis ... and contempt that the ... party was not in fact ... she had once thought it ...

It was in the summer of 1933 ... in Pasadena that I first met my ... wife. She was married to Dr. ... was a friend and ... of the ... and others on the ... Institute of Technology ... I learned of her ... to Joe Heller and ... and been a Communist party of ... and for a year or two ... their brief marriage my ... was a Communist party ... When I met her I found ... her a deep loyalty to her ... husband, a complete dis ... from any political ... and a certain dis ... and contempt that the ... party was not in fact ... she had once thought it ...

Other Remarks of Vines
My own views were also ... A' though Sidney and I ... with a book on Russia ... which I had read in 1934, and ... the talk that I heard at that ... time had predisposed me to make ... much of the economic progress ... and general level of welfare in ... Russia, and little of its political ... progress, my views on this were ... change.

I read about the purge trials ... though not in full detail, and ... would never find a view of them ... which was not damning to the ... Soviet system. In 1935 I met ... three physicists who had actu ... ally lived in Russia in the Kue ... ment-house. All were eminent ... scientists: Plamen, Weinstock ... and Schain; and the first two ... have become close friends. What ... they reported seemed to me as ... much so unparaphrased as true, that ... made a great impression, and ... presented Russia, even when ... from their limited expe ... as a land of purge and ... as ludicrously had man ... and of a long-suffering ...

I need to make clear that this ... hanging opinion of Russia ... which was to be reinforced by ... the Mass-Soviet pact, and the ... behavior of the Soviet Union in ... Poland and in Finland, did so ... mean a sharp work for me with ... those who held to old ... views. At that time I did not ... fully understand—as in time I ... came to understand—how com ... munity the Communist party in ... the country was under the con ... trol of Russia. During and after ... Battle of France, however, ... and during the Battle of England ... and short autumn, I found myself ... increasingly out of sympathy ... with the policy of demagoguery ... and neutrality that the Com ... munist press advocated.

After our marriage in 1935 my ... wife and I for about two years ... had much the same circle of ... friends as I had had before— ... mostly physicists and university ... teachers. Among them the Che ... chers, in particular, showed no ... money talk of kindness. We were ... personally invited to share or ...

... which was the first home we had ... of our own. We settled down to ... live in it with our new baby. We ... had a good many friends, but ... little leisure. My wife was work ... ing in biology at the university. ... Many of the men I had known ... went off to work on radar and ... other aspects of military re ... search. I was not without my ... of these; but it was not until my ... connection with the radi ... atory atomic energy enter ... prise that I began to see any way ... in which I could be of direct use.

The War Years
Ever since the discovery of ... nuclear fission, the possibility of ... powerful explosives based on it ... had been very much in my mind, ... as it had in that of many other ... physicists. We had some under ... standing of what this might do ... for us in the war, and how much ... it might change the course of ... history.

In the summer of 1941, a spe ... cial committee was set up by the ... National Academy of Sciences ... under the chairmanship of Arthur ... Compton to review the prospects ... and feasibility of the different ... uses of atomic energy for mili ... tary purposes. I attended a meet ... ing of the committee; this was ... my first official connection with ... the atomic energy program.

After the Academy meeting, I ... spent some time in preliminary ... calculations about the construc ... tion and performance of atomic ... bombs, and became increasingly ... excited at the prospects.

At the same time I still had a ... quite heavy burden of academic ... work with courses and graduate ... students. I also began to consult ... more or less regularly with the ... staff of the Radiation Laboratory ... in Berkeley on their program for ... the electric-magnetic separation ... of uranium isotopes. I was never ... a member or employee of the lab ... oratory, but I attended many of ... its staff and policy meetings.

With the help of two of my ... graduate students, I developed an ... invention which was embodied in ... the production plants at Oak ... Ridge. I attended the conferences ... in Chicago at which the MetaBur ... gical Laboratory (to produce ... plutonium) was established and ... its initial program projected.

In the spring of 1942 Compton ... called me to Chicago to discuss ... the state of work on the bomb ... itself. During this meeting Com ... pton asked me to take the respon ... sibility of this work, which at ... the time consisted of numerous ... scattered experimental projects. ... Although I had had no adminis ... trative experience and was not an ... experimental physicist, I felt suf ... ficiently informed and challenged ... by the problem to be glad to ... accept. At this time I became an ... employee of the MetaBurgess ... Laboratory.

After this conference I called ... together a theoretical study ... group in Berkeley in which ... E. R. Knapik, Robert Teller, ... Van Vleck and I participated. We ... had an adventurous time. We ... spent much of the summer of ... 1942 in Berkeley in a joint study ... that for the first time really ... came to grips with the physical ...

Continued on Following Page

...with the ...
...ally ...

Telephone calls were monitored, mail was censored, and personnel who left the area—something permitted only for the shortest of causes—knew that their movements might be under surveillance. On the other hand, for those within the community, full expression and discussion among those competent to use the information was encouraged.

Recruitment Program

The last months of 1943 and early 1944 had hardly hours enough to get Los Alamos established. The real problem had to do with getting to Los Alamos the men who would make a success of the undertaking. For this we needed to understand as clearly as we could what our technical program would be, what men we would need, what facilities, what organization, what plan.

The program of recruitment was massive. Even though we then underestimated the ultimate size of the laboratory, which was to have almost 4,000 members by the spring of 1945, and even though we did not at that time see clearly some of the difficulties which were to be faced and threaten the enterprise, we knew that it was a big, complex and difficult job.

Even the initial phase of the laboratory called for a start with more than 100 highly qualified and trained scientists, to say nothing of the technicians, staff and mechanics who would be required for their support, and of the equipment that we would have to buy and borrow since there would be no time to build it from scratch. We had to recruit at a time when the country was fully engaged in war and almost every competent scientist was already involved in the military effort.

The primary burden of this fall on me. To recruit staff I traveled all over the country talking with people who had been working on one or another aspect of the atomic energy enterprise, and people in radar work, for example, and underwater sound, telling them about the job, the place, that we were going to, and enlisting their enthusiasm.

In order to bring responsible scientists to Los Alamos, I had to rely on their sense of the urgency and feasibility of the Los Alamos mission. I had to tell them enough of what the job was, and give strong enough assurances that it might be successfully accomplished in time to affect the outcome of the war, to make it clear that they were

The notion of deserting and the New Mexico desert for an intermediate period and under guard-military suspicion disturbed a good many scientists, and the families of many more. But there was another side to it. Almost everyone realized that this was a great undertaking. Almost everyone knew that if it were completed successfully and rapidly enough, it might alter the outcome of the war. Almost everyone knew that it was an unparalleled opportunity to bring to bear the best knowledge and art of science for the benefit of his country. Almost everyone knew that this job, if it were achieved, would be a part of history.

Common Security Belief

The sense of commitment, of devotion and of patriotism in the mind of most of those who came with whom I talked came to Los Alamos. Once they came, confidence in the enterprise grew as they learned more of the technical status of the work, and though the laboratory was to derive its reputation for many years before the end, once it had started it was on the road to success.

We had information in those days of German activity in the field of nuclear fission. We were aware of what it might mean if they beat us to the draw in the development of atomic bombs. The consensus of all our opinions, and every directive that I had, stressed the extreme urgency of our work, as well as the need for guarding all knowledge of it from our enemies. Past Communist connections or sympathies did not necessarily disqualify a man from employment, if we had confidence in his integrity and dependability as a man.

There are two items of derogatory information on which I need to comment at this point. The first is that it was reported that I had talked the atomic bomb question over with Communist party members during the period (1943-45). The second is that I was responsible for the employment of individuals who were members of the Communist party or closely associated with activities of the Communist party.

As to the first, my only discussions of matters connected with the atomic bomb were for official work or for recruiting the staff of the enterprise. As far as I know none of these discussions were with Communist party members. I never discussed anything of my secret work or anything

with the Executive Laboratory, and to advise and direct the work of some of the graduate students. I taught David Betts and Chaim Richman, a problem of basic science which might prove useful in analyzing experiments in connection with fast neutrons. That work has long been published.

Another graduate student, Reed Lomax, I remember vaguely a conversation with him in which he expressed reluctance to take part in defense research, and I encouraged him to do what other scientists were doing for their country. Thereafter he did work at the Radiation Laboratory.

I remember no details of my life. If I asked him to work on the project, I would have assumed that he would be drafted by the security officers as a matter of course. Later, in 1945, when Lomax was drafted into the Army, he wrote me asking me to help him return to the project. I forwarded a copy of his letter to the Manhattan District Security officers, and let the matter rest there. Bill Baker, at Los Alamos, reported I wrote to his commanding officer that he was qualified for advanced technical work in the Army.

I asked for the transfer of David Betts to Los Alamos; but this request, like all others, was subject to the assumption that the usual security requirements would apply; and when I was told that there was objection on security grounds to this transfer, I was much surprised, but of course agreed.

David Betts was known to the Personnel Director at the laboratory, and I had met and liked him and found him intelligent. I supported the suggestion of the Personnel Director that he come to Los Alamos. I understood that he had had left-wing associations; but it was not until March of 1951, at the time of his testimony, that I knew about his membership in the Communist party.

In 1943 when I was alleged to have stated that "I knew several individuals then at Los Alamos who had been members of the Communist party," I knew of only one; she was my wife, of whose disassociation from the party, and of whose integrity and loyalty to the United States I had no question. Later, in 1944 or 1945, my brother Frank, who had been cleared for work in Berkeley and at Oak Ridge, came to Los Alamos from Oak Ridge with of

total approval. I know of no attempt to check

any of the individuals who have had no history that Chevrolet was actually seeking information, and I was certain that he had no idea of the work on which I was engaged.

It has long been clear to me that I should have reported the incident at once. The reports that led me to report it—which I doubt ever would have become known without my report—were unconnected with it.

During the summer of 1943, Colonel Lomax, the Intelligence Officer of the Manhattan District, came to Los Alamos and told me that he was worried about the security situation in Berkeley because of the activities of the Federation of Architects, Engineers, Chemists and Technicians. This reminded me of what Einstein was a member of, probably a promoter of the F. A. E. C. T.

Shortly thereafter, I was in Berkeley and I told the security officer that Einstein would be leaving. When I was asked to sign a statement that Einstein had attempted, through intermediaries, to approach people on the Project, though I mentioned neither myself nor Chevrolet, later, when General Groves tried to give the details, I told him of my conversation with Chevrolet. I still think of Chevrolet as a friend.

Story of Los Alamos

The story of Los Alamos is long and complex. Part of it is public history. For me it was a time so filled with work, with the need for decision and action and consultation, that there was none for little else.

I lived with my family in the community which was Los Alamos. It was a remarkable community, inspired by a high sense of mission, of duty and of decency, sober, dedicated and remarkably selfless.

There was plenty in the life of Los Alamos to cause irritation: the security restrictions, many of my own, the handicaps and inevitable stumbling of a military post unlike any that had ever existed before, shortages, inequities, and in the laboratory itself the shifting emphasis, different aspects of the technical work as the program moved forward; but I have never in my group more understood more devoted to a common purpose, more willing to personal convenience, more understanding of the role that they were playing in their country's life. Time and again, the technical work of them. Time and

...with the... We worked by...
...of hard and hope...
...of the committee...
...on July 14, 1944, I...
...a member...
...I believe that in the eyes of...
...War Department, and other...
...people, it was to...
...a success as they had...
...possible, given all the...
...possibilities, and...
...a matter of time there were many...
...indications from the Secretary of...
...War and General Groves, and...
...many others that official opinion...
...was one of satisfaction with what...
...had been accomplished.
...At the time I was heard for...
...at Los Alamos not to share...
...the satisfaction, and hard for...
...not to accept the conclusion...
...that I had managed the enter...
...prise well and played a key role...
...in its success. But it needs to be...
...noted that many others contribut...
...ed the decisive ideas and car...
...ried out the work which led to...
...the success, and that my role...
...was that of understanding, encour...
...aging, organizing and doing...
...it over the very specific of...
...atomic clock.

New Status of Report
...Even before the July 14 test...
...and the test of the bomb to...
...show the members of the labor...
...began to have a new concep...
...of the possible impact of what...
...was going on.
...In the early days when...
...was less certain and tension...
...was on, the war with Germany...
...and Japan to a degree...
...it was a comfort for us to...
...know that we had a job to do...
...now, with Germany defeated, the...
...war in the Pacific approaching a...
...close, and the economy of our...
...country almost secured, there...
...was a sense of hope and of...
...relief as to what the post-war...
...development might portend...
...for the future. This came to be...
...a little earlier than to the public...
...generally because we saw the...
...economic development of...
...science and to society, but its...
...quality was very much the same as...
...the public response after Hiro...
...shima and Nagasaki.

...This it was natural that in the...
...spring of 1945 I welcomed the...
...opportunity when I was asked to...
...Secretary of Science to serve, along...
...with Compton, Lawrence and...
...Fermi, as an advisory panel to...
...the Interior Committee on Atomic...
...Energy.
...We met with that committee...
...in the fall of 1945, and even...
...during the week when Hiroshima...
...and Nagasaki were being bombed...
...we met at Los Alamos to sketch...
...out a prospectus of what the...
...technical future in atomic energy...
...might look like. That atomic...
...would be for guided missiles, in...
...particular in bomb design, the...
...thermonuclear program, power...
...production, and the new tools...
...available from atomic technology...
...for research in science, medicine...
...and technology.

...This work absorbed much of...
...time during September and...
...October, and in connection with...
...I was asked to consult with...
...the War and State Departments...
...regarding atomic energy legislation...
...and a preliminary report on the...
...international control of atomic...
...energy.

...I resigned as Director of Los...
...Alamos on Oct. 16, 1945, after...
...having secured the consent of...
...Commander Bradbury and of...
...General Groves that Bradbury...
...should act as my successor.

...There were then on the books...
...of the laboratory, embodied in...
...memoranda and reports and...
...summarized by me in letters to...
...General Groves, developments in...
...atomic weapons, which would...
...well have occupied years for their...
...development, and which have in...
...fact provided some, though by no...
...means all, of the themes for Los...
...Alamos work since that time. It...
...was not entirely clear whether...
...the future of atomic weapons...
...work in this country should be...
...continued at or confined to Los...
...Alamos or started elsewhere at a...
...more accessible and more prac...
...tical site, or indeed what effect...
...international agreements might...
...have on the program. But in the...
...meantime Los Alamos had to be...
...kept going until there was...
...created an authority competent to...
...decide the question of its future...
...This was to take almost a year.

The Post-War Period
...In November, 1945, I resumed...
...my teaching at the California In...
...stitute of Technology. With an...
...optimism and a hope, never real...
...ized, that this should be a full...
...time undertaking, the committee...
...about post-war activities...
...which had already begun to...
...wind, and I was asked over and...
...over both by the Executive and...
...the Congress for advice on atomic...
...energy.

...continued and developed, on...
...years of the changes inherent in...
...comparable developments by the...
...economy, and preventive and dete...
...rrent measures were very much on...
...our minds. Throughout this time...
...the role of atomic weapons was...
...to be central.
...From the time of the war...
...when I returned to the West...
...Coast until finally in the spring...
...of 1947 when I took a position...
...as the Director of the Institute...
...for Advanced Study, I was able...
...to spend very little time at home...
...and in teaching in California.
...In October, 1945, at the request...
...of Secretary of War Patterson, I...
...had testified before the House...
...Committee on Military Affairs in...
...support of the May-Johnson bill...
...which I endorsed as an interim...
...means of bringing about without...
...delay the much needed transition...
...from the war-time administration...
...of the Massachusetts District to...
...normal management of the atomic...
...energy enterprise.

Official Position Resisted
...In December, 1945, and later...
...appeared at Los Alamos in...
...company with some of his Special...
...Committee on Atomic Energy...
...which was considering legislation...
...on the same subject.
...Under the chairmanship of Dr...
...Richard Feynman, I served on a...
...committee set up by General...
...Groves to consider classification...
...policy on matters of atomic en...
...ergy. For two months, early in...
...1946, I worked steadily as a...
...member of a panel, the Board of...
/>Consultants to the Secretary of...
/>State's Committee on Atomic En...
/>ergy, which, with the Secretary...
/>of State's Committee, prepared...
/>the so-called Acheson-Lilienthal...
/>report. After the publication of...
/>this report, I spoke publicly in...
/>support of it.
/>A little later, when Mr. Baruch...
/>was appointed to represent the...
/>United States in the United Na...
/>tions Atomic Energy Committee, I...
/>became one of the scientific...
/>consultants to Mr. Baruch and...
/>his staff in preparation for and...
/>in the conduct of our efforts to...
/>gain support for the United...
/>States plan. I continued as con...
/>sultant to General Groves when...
/>he took over the effort.
/>At the end of 1946 I was ap...
/>pointed by the President as a...
/>member of the General Advisory...
/>Committee to the Atomic Energy...
/>Commission. At its first meeting...
/>I was elected chairman, and was...
/>re-elected until the expiration of...
/>my term in 1951. This was my...
/>principal assignment during these...
/>years as far as the atomic en...
/>ergy program was concerned, and...
/>my principal preoccupations apart...
/>from academic work.

...A little later I was appointed...
/>to the Committee on Atomic...
/>Energy of the Research and De...
/>velopment Board, which was to...
/>advise the Military Establishment...
/>about the technical aspects of...
/>the atomic energy program. I served...
/>on it for some years, and twice...
/>was designated chairman of spe...
/>cial panels set up by the commit...
/>tee.
/>Meanwhile I had become widely...
/>regarded as a principal author...
/>or inventor of the atomic bomb...
/>was widely, and I know, that...
/>the facts were distorted. In a mod...
/>est way I had become a kind of...
/>public personage.
/>I was deluged, as I have been...
/>ever since, with requests to lec...
/>ture and to take part in sum...
/>mers of scientific activities and public...
/>affairs. Most of these I did not...
/>accept. Some, important for the...
/>promotion of science or learning...
/>or of public policies that corre...
/>sponded to my convictions, I did...
/>accept. The Council of the Na...
/>tional Academy of Sciences, the...
/>Committee on the Frontiers of...
/>Science, the Board of Overseers...
/>of Harvard College, and a good...
/>number of others.

...A quite different and I believe...
/>unique occurrence is cited as...
/>evidence of derogatory information...
/>that in 1946 I was "lured as was...
/>chairman on the left-hand of the...
/>Independent Citizens Committee...
/>of the Arts, Sciences, Professions...
/>Inc." I stated as a Chairman...
/>from by the House Committee on...
/>Un-American Activities.
/>The fact is that in 1946 when...
/>I was at work on the interna...
/>tional control of atomic energy...
/>I was notified that I had been...
/>nominated and then elected as...
/>vice chairman of this organiza...
/>tion.

...When I began to see that the...
/>situation included danger such...
/>as "Wither United States...
/>troops from China," and that I...
/>was surrounded by the then Secretary...
/>Wallace of United States policy...
/>on atomic energy, I advised the...
/>organization in a letter on Oct...
/>11, 1946, that I was not in accord...
/>with its policy, that I resigned...
/>the vice-chairmanship of Mr. Wal...
/>lace as not likely to advance the...
/>cause of finding a satisfactory...
/>solution for the control of atomic...
/>energy.

...I began to see that the...
/>situation included danger such...
/>as "Wither United States...
/>troops from China," and that I...
/>was surrounded by the then Secretary...
/>Wallace of United States policy...
/>on atomic energy, I advised the...
/>organization in a letter on Oct...
/>11, 1946, that I was not in accord...
/>with its policy, that I resigned...
/>the vice-chairmanship of Mr. Wal...
/>lace as not likely to advance the...
/>cause of finding a satisfactory...
/>solution for the control of atomic...
/>energy.

World's Tallest... Oppenheimer to... ...Washington, Aug 13-

Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer de...
scribed himself as very much...
the ordinary scientist and pro...
fessor, indifferent to what was...
going on in the world, until...
this 1945.

...This is explained in his...
answer to the Atomic Energy...
Commission's action in denying...
him security clearance, and...
told why he began to change...
and take an interest in political...
and economic problems.
He wrote that he had b...
continuing wondering "why...
about the treatment of Jews...
Germany." He "was when...
the depression was doing to my...
citizens—"after they could...
go no job or inadequate job...
"Through them," he said, "I...
began to sense the deeper...
nature of the great depression...
I began to understand how...
deeply political and economic...
events could affect man's lives...
I began to feel the need to...
participate more fully in the...
life of the community."

...But I had no background...
of political conviction or in...
terest to give me perspective...
in these matters.

...Things dated membership in the...
Communist party.)

...I again said that I could not...
have been present at a closed...
meeting of the Communist party...
because I was not a member...
of the party; that I had searched...
for security and that the only...
thing that unconsciously could...
be relevant was the vaguest of...
impressions that someone on the...
campus might at some time have...
made a connection to him or been...
for a gathering of young people...
that, however, I could recall no...
such gathering, nor any meeting...
even remotely resembling the one...
described by Crockett; that I...
thought it probable that at the...
time of the meeting, which...
then had been fixed by Crockett...
at approximately July 25, my wife...
and I were away from Berkeley.
Shortly thereafter, with the...
old of summer, we were able to...
return to the city and I met...
Berkeley within ten days after...
July 4, 1941, and did not return...
until toward the end of the first...
week in August.

...I need to tell now in an...
account of some of the measures...
which the Chairman of the...
General Advisory Committee, and in...
other capacities, I advocated in...
the years since the war to in...
crease the power of the United...
States and its allies to meet...
and defeat aggression.

General Members Listed

...The initial members of the...
General Advisory Committee...
were: Consult, then president...
of Harvard; Paul Dirac, president...
of the California Institute of...
Technology; Fermi of the University...
of Chicago; Rabi of Columbia...
University; Rabi, vice president...
of the United Fruit Company;
Norman V. Pease, president of...
California; Cyril Smith of the...
University of Chicago; and...
Worthington of the Bell Telephone...
Company. In 1946 Dudley...
president of the Bell Telephone...
Laboratories, replaced Worthing...
ton in the committee. In 1950...
Fermi, Rabi, and Serber were...
replaced by Libby of the University...
of Chicago; Alpher, president...
of Standard Oil Development...
Company, and Whitman of the...
Massachusetts Institute of...
Technology. Later, Smith...
resigned and was succeeded by...
von Neumann of the Institute...
for Advanced Study.

...In these years from early 1945...
to mid-1951 the committee met...
some thirty times and trans...
mitted perhaps 600 reports...
to the commission.
Formulation of policy and the...
management of the vast atomic...
energy enterprises were responsi...
bilities vested in the commission...
itself. The General Advisory...
Committee had the role, which was...
fixed for it by statute, to advise...
the commission.

...In that capacity we gave the...
commission our views on ques...
tions which the commission put...
before us, brought to the...
commission's attention our...
technical matters of impor...
tance, and encouraged and...
supported the work of the several...
major institutions of the...
commission.

...At one of our first meetings in...
1947 we settled down to the...
of forming our own views of...
the priorities. And while we agreed...
that the development of atomic...
power and the support and main...
tenance of a strong national...
activity in the fields relevant...
to it were important, we agreed...
to give priority to the problem of

World's Tallest... Oppenheimer to... ...Washington, Aug 13-

Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer de...
scribed himself as very much...
the ordinary scientist and pro...
fessor, indifferent to what was...
going on in the world, until...
this 1945.

...This is explained in his...
answer to the Atomic Energy...
Commission's action in denying...
him security clearance, and...
told why he began to change...
and take an interest in political...
and economic problems.
He wrote that he had b...
continuing wondering "why...
about the treatment of Jews...
Germany." He "was when...
the depression was doing to my...
citizens—"after they could...
go no job or inadequate job...
"Through them," he said, "I...
began to sense the deeper...
nature of the great depression...
I began to understand how...
deeply political and economic...
events could affect man's lives...
I began to feel the need to...
participate more fully in the...
life of the community."

...But I had no background...
of political conviction or in...
terest to give me perspective...
in these matters.

...Things dated membership in the...
Communist party.)

...I again said that I could not...
have been present at a closed...
meeting of the Communist party...
because I was not a member...
of the party; that I had searched...
for security and that the only...
thing that unconsciously could...
be relevant was the vaguest of...
impressions that someone on the...
campus might at some time have...
made a connection to him or been...
for a gathering of young people...
that, however, I could recall no...
such gathering, nor any meeting...
even remotely resembling the one...
described by Crockett; that I...
thought it probable that at the...
time of the meeting, which...
then had been fixed by Crockett...
at approximately July 25, my wife...
and I were away from Berkeley.
Shortly thereafter, with the...
old of summer, we were able to...
return to the city and I met...
Berkeley within ten days after...
July 4, 1941, and did not return...
until toward the end of the first...
week in August.

...I need to tell now in an...
account of some of the measures...
which the Chairman of the...
General Advisory Committee, and in...
other capacities, I advocated in...
the years since the war to in...
crease the power of the United...
States and its allies to meet...
and defeat aggression.

General Members Listed

...The initial members of the...
General Advisory Committee...
were: Consult, then president...
of Harvard; Paul Dirac, president...
of the California Institute of...
Technology; Fermi of the University...
of Chicago; Rabi of Columbia...
University; Rabi, vice president...
of the United Fruit Company;
Norman V. Pease, president of...
California; Cyril Smith of the...
University of Chicago; and...
Worthington of the Bell Telephone...
Company. In 1946 Dudley...
president of the Bell Telephone...
Laboratories, replaced Worthing...
ton in the committee. In 1950...
Fermi, Rabi, and Serber were...
replaced by Libby of the University...
of Chicago; Alpher, president...
of Standard Oil Development...
Company, and Whitman of the...
Massachusetts Institute of...
Technology. Later, Smith...
resigned and was succeeded by...
von Neumann of the Institute...
for Advanced Study.

...In these years from early 1945...
to mid-1951 the committee met...
some thirty times and trans...
mitted perhaps 600 reports...
to the commission.
Formulation of policy and the...
management of the vast atomic...
energy enterprises were responsi...
bilities vested in the commission...
itself. The General Advisory...
Committee had the role, which was...
fixed for it by statute, to advise...
the commission.

...In that capacity we gave the...
commission our views on ques...
tions which the commission put...
before us, brought to the...
commission's attention our...
technical matters of impor...
tance, and encouraged and...
supported the work of the several...
major institutions of the...
commission.

...At one of our first meetings in...
1947 we settled down to the...
of forming our own views of...
the priorities. And while we agreed...
that the development of atomic...
power and the support and main...
tenance of a strong national...
activity in the fields relevant...
to it were important, we agreed...
to give priority to the problem of

...The record of laboratory reports...
and other activities of the...
General Advisory Committee will...
show that that body within the...
limits of its role as an advisory...
group played a significant, con...
sistent and unchanging role in...
encouraging and supporting...
and sometimes initiating the...
measures which are responsible for...
these results.
As a committee and individu...
ally, our advice can be sought...
on other matters as well. In early...
October, 1945, I had testified...
before a Senate committee on the...
Hiroshima-Nagasaki bomb—the...
initial momentum for a National...
Science Foundation; the most...
significant I was concerned that...
I had taken for granted in the...
United States a healthy sci...
entific community after the...
disruption of the war years.
In the General Advisory Com...
mittee we encouraged the...
commission to do everything it...
properly could to support atomic...
science, both in its own labora...
tories and in the university...
centers to which we felt we must...
look for the training of scien...
tists for advances of a basic...
character.
Throughout the past year I...
my colleagues and I stressed the...
importance of continuing support...
and promotion of basic science...
that there might be a healthy...
balance between the effort...
to develop military weapons and...
applied science, and that invest...
ment in pure scientific training...
and research which is indispensable...
to all else. We supported the...
commission's decision to make...
available for distribution to...
university teachers and with ap...
propriate safeguards the broad...
materials, isotopes and radioactive...
substances which have played a...
constructive part in science...
in biological research, in...
technology, in pure science and in...
agriculture.
We took an effective view of...
the development of reactor...
technology and naval propulsion...
not only for their direct military...
value but also because they...
represented a favorable and...
rewarding step in the...
program of nuclear development.
We were, for the most part...
skeptical about the initially...
very ambitious plans for the...
development of nuclear power...

General History of the Atomic Energy Commission

I resigned as Director of Los Alamos on Oct. 16, 1945, after having secured the consent of General Dyer that Bradbury should act as my successor. There were then on the books of the laboratory, submitted in memoranda and reports and summarized by me in letters to General Dyer, developments in atomic weapons, which would still have occupied years for their settlement, and which have not provided since, though by no means all of the themes for Los Alamos work since that time. It was not entirely clear whether the history of atomic weapons work in this country should be continued at or confined to Los Alamos or started elsewhere as a new scientific and more practical site, or indeed what practical international agreements might have on the program. But in the meantime Los Alamos had to be kept going until there was created an authority competent to handle the question of its future, and this was to take almost a year.

The Post-War Period

In November, 1945, I resumed my teaching at the California Institute of Technology. With an intention and a hope, never realized, that this should be a full-time undertaking. The committee about post-war matters which had already begun continuing, and I was asked over and over both by the Executive and the Congress for advice on atomic energy.

I had a feeling of deep responsibility, interest and concern for security of the problems with which the development of atomic energy confronted our country.

This development was to be a major factor in the history of the evolving and mounting conflict between the free world and the Soviet Union. When I and other scientists were called on for advice, our principal duty was to make our technical experience and judgment available. We were asked to do this in a context and against a background of the official views of the Government on the military and political situation of our country. Immediately after the war, I was deeply involved in the effort to devise active means for the international control of atomic weapons, which might, in the words of those days, lead toward the elimination of war itself.

As the prospects of success receded, and as evidence of Soviet hostility and growing military power accumulated, we had more and more to devote ourselves to finding ways of adapting our atomic potential to offset the Soviet threat.

In the period marked by the new Soviet atomic explosion, the war in Korea, and the Chinese Communist intervention, there were principally preoccupied, though we never forgot long-range problems, with immediate measures which could rapidly build up the strength of the United States under the threat of an imminent general war.

Under our own atomic potential,

I only changed, as a consequence, with requests to lecture and to take part in scientific and public affairs. Most of these I did not accept. Some, important for the promotion of science or learning or of public policies that responded to my convictions, I did accept: the Council of the National Academy of Sciences, the Committee on the Present Danger, the Board of Governors of Harvard College, and a good number of others.

A quite different, and I believe more necessary, to take an action of derogatory information—that in 1945 I was "listed as vice chairman on the letterhead of the Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, Professions, Inc." I was asked as a Commissioner of the Board of the Committee of Un-American Activities.

The fact is that in 1945 when I was at work on the international control of atomic energy, I was notified that I had been nominated and then elected as chairman of the organization.

When I began to see that the situation included danger such as "Withdraw United States troops from China," and that it was concerning the criticism, expressed by the then Secretary Wallace of United States policy on atomic energy, I advised the organization in a letter on Oct. 11, 1946, that I was not in accord with its policy, that I regarded the recommendations of Mr. Wallace as not likely to advance the cause of finding a satisfactory solution for the control of atomic energy, and that I wished to resign. When an effort was made to dissuade me from this move, I again wrote on Dec. 2, 1946, insisting upon resignation.

Later in the post-war period an incident occurred which seems to be the basis of one of the rumors of derogatory information. In May, 1950, Paul Crouch, a former Communist official, and Mrs. Crouch testified before the California State Committee on Un-American Activities that in July, 1941, they had attended a Communist party meeting at a home in Berkeley, at which I was the tenant.

On the basis of pictures and stories of me which they saw some eight years later, they said they recognized me as having been present. When the F. B. I. first talked to me about this alleged incident, I was quite certain that no such meeting as Crouch described had occurred, so was my wife, when I discussed it with her. Later, when I saw the testimony, I became even more certain.

Crouch had described the gathering as a closed meeting of the Communist party. I was never a member of the party. Crouch said that no introductions had been made. I could not recall ever having had a group of people at my home that had not been introduced in May of 1941. I again discussed this alleged meeting with the United States attorney in the Weinberg case (Foster). ("An indictment against Joseph Weinberg for perjury for having among other things provided weapons suitable

for the Red program. Laboratory, replaced Weinberg; in the summer of 1941, Paul Crouch and Bradbury were replaced by Lacey of the University of Chicago; Murphree, president of Standard Oil Development Company, and Whitman of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Later, Lacey resigned, and was succeeded by Van Neumann of the Institute for Advanced Study.

In these years from early 1947 to mid-1951 the committee met some thirty times and transmitted perhaps as many reports to the commission.

Formulation of policy and the management of the vast atomic energy enterprise were responsibilities vested in the commission itself. The General Advisory Committee had the role, which was tried for it by statute, to advise the commission.

In that capacity we gave the commission our views on questions which the commission perceived as being brought to the commission's attention on our initiative technical matters of importance, and encouraged and supported the work of the several major installations of the commission.

At one of our first meetings in 1947 we settled down to the job of forming our own views of the priorities. And while we agreed that the development of atomic power and the support and maintenance of a strong basic scientific activity in the fields relevant to it were important, we assigned priority to the problem of atomic weapons.

At that time we advised the commission that one of its first jobs should be to convert Los Alamos into an active center for the development and improvement of atomic weapons.

In 1945-46 during the period immediately following the war, the purpose of Los Alamos was multiple. It was the only laboratory in the United States that worked on atomic weapons. Los Alamos also had wide interests in scientific matters only indirectly related to the weapons program.

We suggested that the commission recognize as the laboratory's central and primary program the improvement and diversification of atomic weapons, and that this undertaking have a priority status to none. We suggested further that the commission make administrative measures to make work at Los Alamos attractive, to assist the laboratory in recruiting, to help build up a strong theoretical division for guidance in atomic weapons design, and to take advantage of the availability of the talented and brilliant consultants who had been members of the laboratory during the war.

In close consultation with the Director of the Los Alamos Laboratory, we encouraged and supported measures of development which would markedly increase the value of our stockpile in terms of the destructive power of our weapons, which would make the best use of existing stockpiles and those anticipated, which would provide weapons suitable

for them. In the United States a healthy scientific community after the disruption of the war years.

In the General Advisory Committee we encouraged the commission to do everything that it properly could to support atomic science, both in its own laboratories and in the university centers to which we felt we must look for the training of scientists for advances of a basic character.

Throughout the post-war period my colleagues and I stressed the importance of continuing support and promotion of basic science so that there might be a healthy balance between the effort invested in military research and applied science, and that invested in pure scientific training and research which is indispensable to all else. We supported the commission's decision to make available for distribution to appropriate departments and with appropriate insignificance the tracer materials, isotopes and radioactive substances which have played so constructive a part in medicine, in biological research, in technology, in pure science and in agriculture.

We took an affirmative view of the development of reactors for submarine and naval propulsion not only for their direct military value but also because they seemed a favorable and forward-looking step in the important program of reactor development.

We were for the most part skeptical about the initially very ambitious plans for the propulsion of aircraft, though we advocated the studies which in time brought this program to a more feasible course. We frequently pointed out that the commission the technical benefits which would accrue to the United States by closer collaboration with the atomic energy enterprise in Canada and the United Kingdom.

During all the years that I served on the General Advisory Committee, however, my major preoccupation was with the production and perfection of atomic weapons. On the various recommendations which I have described, there were never, as far as I can remember, any significant divergences of opinion among the members of the committee. These recommendations, of course, constitute a very small sample of the committee's work, but a typical one.

The "Super" Bombs

In view of the circumstances that have developed I have left the subject of the "Super" and thermonuclear weapons for separate discussion, although our committee regarded this as a phase of the entire problem of weapons.

The Super Staff had a long history of consideration beginning, as I have said, with our initial studies in 1942 before Los Alamos was established. It continued to be the subject of study and research at Los Alamos throughout the war.

After the war, Los Alamos

Continued on Following Page

Scientist Cites '2 Decade' of My Life

Continued From Front Page

It was inevitably disappointed in the enactment of necessary legislation for the atomic energy enterprise. With the Eisenhower Act, the appointment of the Atomic Energy Commission, and the General Advisory Committee, as in the committee had occasion at our early meetings in 1947 as well as in 1948 to discuss the subject.

In that period the General Advisory Committee pointed out the still extremely unclear status of the problem from a technical standpoint, and urged emergency action of Los Alamos efforts which were then directed toward modest exploration of the super and of thermonuclear systems. A serious controversy arose about the Super until the Soviet explosion of an atomic bomb in the autumn of 1949.

Shortly after that event in October, 1949, the Atomic Energy Commission called a special session of the General Advisory Committee and asked us to consider and advise on two related questions:

First, whether in view of the Soviet advance the commission's program was adequate, and, if not, in what way it should be altered or increased; second, whether a "dash" program for the development of the Super should be a part of any new program.

The committee considered both questions, consulted various officials from the civil and military branches of the Executive Department who would have been concerned, and reached conclusions which were communicated in a report to the Atomic Energy Commission in October, 1949.

This report, in response to the first question that had been put to us, recommended a great number of measures that the commission should take to increase in many ways our overall potential in weapons.

The Commission's Position

As to the Super Bomb, the General Advisory Committee stated its unanimous opposition to the initiation by the United States of a crash program of the kind we had been asked to advise on. The report of that meeting, and the secretary's notes, reflect the reasons which served us to this conclusion.

The answer, in particular, which dealt more with political and policy considerations—the report proper was essentially technical in character—indicated differences in the views of members of the committee. There were two advices, one signed by Conant, Dullberg, Smith, Ebert, Stockley and myself. (The sixth member of the committee, Rosenberg, was absent at the time.)

It would have been surprising if eight men considering a problem of extreme difficulty had previously the same reasons for conviction in which we joined. But I think I am correct in asserting that the unanimous opposition we expressed to the crash program was based on the conviction, to which technical considerations as well as others contributed, that because of our overall situation at that time such a program might weaken rather than strengthen the position of the United States.

After the report was submitted to the commission, it fell to me as chairman of the committee to explain our position on several occasions, once at a meeting of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy. All this, however, took place prior to the decision by the President to proceed with the thermonuclear program.

This is the full story of my opposition to the hydrogen bomb. It can be read in the records of the General Advisory Committee and the transcript of my testimony before the Joint Congressional Committee. It is a story which ended once and for all when in January, 1950, the President announced his decision to proceed with the program.

I never urged anyone not to work on the hydrogen bomb project. I never made or caused any distribution of the G. A. C. reports except to the commission itself. As always, it was the commission's responsibility to determine further distribution.

Furthermore a proper function for me to speak my best judgment to discuss with their responsibility engaged in the undertaking. Throughout the whole development of thermonuclear weapons, many conditions occurred where it was necessary for me to derive and to express judgments of feasibility. This was true before the President's decision, and it was true after the President's decision.

Mean Progress Reports

In our report of October, 1949, we expressed the view, as your letter states, that "an imaginative and concerted attack on the problem has a better than even chance of producing the weapon within five years." Later evaluations and measurements made at Los Alamos led us to a more pessimistic view. Still later, however, it was found that the possibility of some development of very great promise.

At such stage the General Advisory Committee, and I as its chairman and as a member of other bodies, reported as faithfully as we could our evaluation of what was likely to fall out of what was likely to work.

In the spring of 1951 work had reached a stage at which far-reaching decisions were called for with regard to the commission's whole thermonuclear program. In consultation with the commission, I called a meeting in Princeton in the late spring of that year, which was attended by all members of the commission and several members of its staff, by members of the General Advisory Committee, by Dr. Bradbury and staff of the Los Alamos Laboratory, by Bethe, Teller, Ebert, Fermi, von Neumann, Wheeler and others responsible connected with the program. The outcome of the meeting, which lasted for two or three days, was an agreed program and a fixing of priorities and effort both for Los Alamos and for other aspects of the commission's work. The

program has been an outstanding success.

In addition to my continued work on the General Advisory Committee, there were other assignments that I was asked to undertake.

Late in 1950 or early in 1951, the President appointed me to the Science Advisory Committee to advise the Office of Defense Mobilization and the President. In 1951 the Secretary of State appointed me to a panel to advise on armaments and their regulation; and I served as consultant on substantial defense, civil defense, and the use of atomic weapons in support of peace and stability.

Many of these duties led to reports in the drafting of which I participated, or for which I took responsibility. These supplements the record of the General Advisory Committee as an account of the extent that I have given my Government during the last eight years.

In this letter, I have written only of those limited parts of my history which appear relevant to the issue now before the Atomic Energy Commission. In order to preserve as much as possible the perspective of the story, I have dealt very briefly with many matters. I have had to deal briefly or not at all with matters in which my actions or views were adverse to Soviet or Communist interest, and of actions that testify to my devotion to freedom, or that have contributed to the vitality, influence and power of the United States.

In preparing this letter, I have reviewed two decades of my life. I have recalled instances where I acted wrongly. What I have hoped was not that I would wholly avoid error, but that I might learn from it. What I have learned has, I think, made me more fit to serve my country.

Very truly yours,
J. Robert Oppenheimer
Princeton, N. J., March 4, 1954.

976

Part of the United States

After the report was submitted to the commission, it fell to me as chairman of the committee to explain our position on several occasions, once at a meeting of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy. All this, however, took place prior to the decision by the President to proceed with the thermonuclear program.

This is the full story of my participation in the hydrogen bomb project.

It can be read in the records of the General Advisory Committee and the transcript of my testimony before the Joint Congressional Committee. It is a story which spread wide and far all over the world in January, 1950, the President announced his decision to proceed with the program.

I never urged anyone not to work on the hydrogen bomb project. I never made or caused any restriction of the G. A. C. reports except to the commission itself. As given it was the commission's responsibility to determine further distribution.

In summary, in October, 1949, I and the other members of the General Advisory Committee were asked questions by the commission to which we had a duty to respond, and to which we did respond with our best judgment in the light of evidence then available to us.

Savannah River Project

When the President's decision was announced in January, 1950, our committee was again in session and we immediately turned to the technical problems facing the commission in carrying out the President's directive.

We sought to give our advice then and in ensuing meetings as to the most promising methods of solving these problems. We never again raised the question of the wisdom of the policy which had now been settled, but concerned ourselves rather with trying to carry out the program.

During this period our recommendations for increasing production facilities included one for a dual purpose plant which would be adapted to make materials either for fusion bombs or materials useful to a thermonuclear program. In its performance characteristics, the Savannah River project, subsequently adopted by the commission, was overshadowed by this recommendation.

While the history of the G. A. C. commission is a crash program for the Super ended with the announcement of the President's decision, the need for evaluation and advice continued. There were numerous technical complications both before and after the President's decision. It was of course a primary duty of the commission, as well as other review committees on which I served, to report on developments which we judged promising, and to report when a given weapon or family of weapons appeared impractical, infeasible or impossible.

It would have been my duty to report had I been alone in my views. As a matter of fact, our views on such matters were almost always unanimous. It was

Today in Washington

Oppenheimer's Side Gave Publicity to His Suspension

By DAVID LAWRENCE

WASHINGTON, April 13.—The strange case of Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer, leading atomist scientist, who has been formally suspended by President Eisenhower and the Atomic Energy Commission from access to classified material pending a study of his security status, illustrates better than millions of words of debate or television pictures what a difficult problem the government of the United States is up against nowadays.

On the one hand, the Congressional committees are assailed as unfair and as engaged in "witch hunting," and the cry is heard that every man must be considered innocent until proved guilty. But, on the other hand, affiliation with the government is not a right or privilege and employees can be ruled as security risks merely because there is reasonable doubt as to their eligibility to remain in the government. It is not a court procedure at all.

Probe Not Published

At this writing, nobody knows whether Dr. Oppenheimer is or is not a good security risk for continuance as a member of the Science Advisory Committee under the Office of Defense Mobilization. His file has been under review for some time, and his suspension took place in December, 1953. In accordance with the rules of fair play, the Eisenhower administration didn't publicize this fact. It refused to be a party to the arousing of public suspicion, since it was not prejudging the case but was dealing with it confidentially and in an orderly manner.

Then how did it get into the headlines? It came from the Oppenheimer side. Selected newspaper reporters were given all the documents and the right to publish them Tuesday morning. The all-important fact that the initiative came from the Oppenheimer side—probably his attorneys—was not disclosed in the press in the articles on Tuesday morning. The Atomic Energy Commission, however, promptly issued a statement explaining that it had sought to "protect the privacy of individual security boards" and that "departure from this practice in this instance is only due to the fact that Dr. Oppenheimer has exercised his privilege of making public an account of the matter."

Why did Dr. Oppenheimer decide on full publicity? It is often done as a device to forestall an attack, and perhaps in this case the hint given by Ben McCarthy in his television speech last week—without mentioning

any names—that there was something mysterious about the delay in deciding to make the H-bomb indicated that maybe the Wisconsin Senator himself was going to blow the lid off. Hence it may have seemed better to get all the documents out first, with the Oppenheimer version given sympathetic handling in the press.

Now it is disclosed by Sen. Mundt of South Dakota and by members of the House that the whole matter was under scrutiny by the McCarthy committee about last May but that the Wisconsin Senator had decided several months ago not to go into the subject, since it would be handled by another committee or executive agency.

It could be that the speech by Sen. McCarthy had no relationship to the Oppenheimer publicity effort to argue the case in advance, yet the effect was to link the two in public speculation. The situation is by no means clarified yet, and the strategists who advised Dr. Oppenheimer may find in the end they made a mistake in forcing the case into the open before all the facts had been gathered and the investigation had been completed.

Policy Recommendations

So far as the public is concerned, it now will want to know not so much the details of the "derogatory information" in the file of Dr. Oppenheimer—as the phrase is used by the Atomic Energy Commission in its statement—but the reasons and motivations for some of the curious recommendations of policy made by the scientist. In the top councils of the government, for example, he opposed the Strategic Air Command concept of the United States Air Force and dived in military strategy. He opposed the use of bombs as a "deterrent." He argued for more disclosures to the world of atomic data, and he was opposed to the development of the H-bomb. A restatement of Dr. Oppenheimer's views now becomes more important than ever.

The whole episode illustrates why it is not so easy to answer security questions without a lot of background and why publicity isn't always the fault of the Congressional committees.

Dr. Oppenheimer was a leader and his leadership meant that nearly all the scientists were opposed to American development of the H-bomb. The average citizen will wonder why he was so active in matters outside the field of science, but it is only fair that the Oppenheimer case not be prejudged till all the facts are revealed.

New York
Herald Tribune
April 14 1954

100-34368-18

SEARCHED	INDEXED
SERIALIZED	FILED
APR 14 1954	
FBI NEWARK	

Thompson

The Oppenheimer Case

When Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer entered government war-time service, in the spring of 1942, he filled out his first security questionnaire. He was informed that there was some doubt as to his clearance on the ground that he had belonged to various Left Wing groups. Yet after investigation he was allowed to proceed. His work led him from the Metallurgical Laboratory at Chicago to the desert site of Los Alamos, where the atom bomb was developed under his over-all direction.

Those early Left Wing associations form the major part of the charges against Dr. Oppenheimer which have caused his suspension from the advisory committee of the Atomic Energy Commission. Certain other derogatory information was reviewed in 1947 and held not to affect his security status; such old items as that he knowingly hired Communists for work at Los Alamos or spoke to Communists of the atomic project are categorically denied by Dr. Oppenheimer in his answer to the latest charges. There is also the assertion that after the President decided to go ahead with the hydrogen bomb, Dr. Oppenheimer continued his opposition by trying to persuade other scientists not to work on the project. This is new and has not, apparently, been reviewed previously by any security board. In his answer Dr. Oppenheimer claims the charge to be false and asserts that, with the other members of his advisory committee, he worked single-mindedly to advance the H-bomb once the policy had been established.

All these charges together have been held of sufficient weight to justify a re-examination of his case under the procedures of the atomic energy act. A distinguished board has been appointed under the chairmanship of Gordon Gray; Lloyd Garrison is representing Dr. Oppenheimer as counsel, and there is every assurance that the hearings now in process will be conducted with complete fairness.

That a man of Dr. Oppenheimer's eminence and undisputed services to the nation should now be put through such a test is, nevertheless, deeply troubling. If the account of his life and work set forth in his moving letter should fail to stand up under investigation, it will mean that one more breach has been made in the confidence with which our citizens have been accustomed to look on one another. If Dr. Oppenheimer, on the other hand, is held to be loyal yet disqualified by early left-wing associations from further government service, the cost of our security regulations will be seen to be tragically high. Even assuming the best, that this distinguished scientist should be entirely vindicated, the ordeal will be heavy and not soon forgotten.

The encouraging aspect of the case is that the investigation should be in good hands and under sound procedures. It can be hoped and believed that what Dr. Oppenheimer admits to have been errors in the pre-war years will be judged in the context of the total picture, including all that his genius has contributed, and has still to contribute, to the advancement of science and the safety of the country. If the case had been taken up by Senator McCarthy, such perspective and judgment would have been impossible. According to reports, Senator McCarthy is planning even now to leap in with sensational claims of his own. With the executive branch having the charges under advisement, such an intervention would be entirely unjustified. The people will insist on justice in the Oppenheimer case—and they will know where to look for it.

New York
Herald Tribune

April 14, 1954

pg. 22.

100-29368-77

SEARCHED	INDEXED
SERIALIZED	FILED
APR 16 1954	
FBI - NEWARK	

T. Kelly

MATTER OF FACT

By JOSEPH and STEWART ALBOP

The Oppenheimer Case

WASHINGTON.

It may seem odd that any one should be called upon to defend the loyalty of the man who more than any other man, first gave this country the atomic bomb. Ever since the war, after all, the atomic bomb has been the principal military weapon in the free world's arsenal in the struggle against Soviet imperialism.

Yet this man, the great physicist J. Robert Oppenheimer, is now under attack. As revealed yesterday, hearings are currently being held to determine whether or not Dr. Oppenheimer is a loyal American citizen. What is more, Sen. Joseph R. McCarthy is making obvious preparations to rescue himself from his present low political estate by destroying Oppenheimer.

It is true, as his friends and admirers admit, that there was a time in the late '30s and early '40s when Dr. Oppenheimer showed bad political judgment. It is always conceivable that he showed worse than bad judgment—anything is conceivable in these times of the wars of political religions. But to those who know the brilliantly able Oppenheimer, this is only conceivable in theory.

Dr. Oppenheimer will certainly have a fair hearing from the board of three fair-minded men, headed by former Secretary of the Army Gordon Gray, who have been recruited to hear his case. But he will have anything but a fair hearing from McCarthy. And just because he is unquestionably vulnerable to McCarthy's brand of attack, it is worth trying to understand how so brilliant a man came to exercise bad political judgment a decade and a half ago.

This attempt may be futile, in these days when the old Biblical injunction—"Judge Not That Ye Be Not Judged"—is accounted positively subversive in some quarters. But for those who still do not equate Christian charity with softness toward Communism, the facts are these:

In the first place, through all his early years, until he was well over thirty years old, Dr. Oppenheimer knew hardly more about politics than a child. This was in the days when only a comparative handful of men in the whole world were practicing theoretical physics. The physicist lived in a closed and cloistered world of his own. The rest of the world could not understand even the basic language which he used to communicate his ideas, and thus the rest of the world meant little to him.

This remarkable isolation lasted, for Dr. Oppenheimer, until about 1936, four years after Hitler came to power. About this point, the outside world suddenly burst, as it were, into his laboratory. It was not a pretty world.

In 1936, after all, and in the years that followed, the Western democracies and the Soviet Union alike were on the defensive against the onrush of Germany and its Fascist allies. Adolf Hitler was moving from triumph to triumph, slaughtering Oppenheimer's fellow Jews as he moved. Among these fellow Jews were relatives of Oppenheimer in Germany, some of whom he succeeded in rescuing, but some of whom he did not.

In the circumstances, it is not altogether surprising that Dr. Oppenheimer experienced a somewhat emotional reaction to his belated awakening to politics. Under similar pressures, some silly people—like Oppenheimer's younger brother, who joined the Communist party briefly, and who even stupidly flirted with the Wallace movement after he had resigned from the Party—completely lost their balance.

From the evidence presently available, Oppenheimer never lost his balance in this way. He never considered himself a Communist. For one thing, "Marxism never made sense" to him. But like other respectable and politically naive people, he did, no doubt, consider the Communists as faintly disreputable but useful allies in the fight against Nazism. Just as respectable people now consider Fascists, foreign or homegrown, useful allies in the fight against Communism.

In those days, Dr. Oppenheimer apparently saw no harm in associating with Communists. Some of these, like Communist leader Steve Nelson, were old associates of his wife, who had married a Communist and briefly joined the Communist party herself, in her early twenties. Dr. Oppenheimer was even naive enough to contribute to the causes he favored—like the Spanish Loyalists—through party functionaries.

All this was certainly very woolly-headed. Although the Soviet Union was then on the defensive, the Communists were then as much the promoters of the night of the mind as ever since. It may be said, too, that Dr. Oppenheimer, when in 1941 and 1950 he experienced a sort of mental horror about the hydrogen bomb, was being woolly-headed again.

But this moral revulsion also at least understands where a weapon which can kill several million people at a stroke is concerned.

And somehow it does seem likely that the United States is ready to cast its best physicist into outer darkness as punishment for the woolly-headedness of a decade and a half ago—not unless Sen. McCarthy has more success promoting the night of the mind in the United States than people realize.

Copyright, 1954, by J. P. S. Books, Inc.

New York
Herald Tribune

100-319360-20
SEARCHED INDEXED
SERIALIZED FILED
APR 15 1954
FBI NEWARK
T. Kelly

DR. OPPENHEIMER SUSPENDED BY A.E.C. IN SECURITY REVIEW; SCIENTIST DEFENDS RECORD

N.Y. TIMES 4/13/54



Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer

HEARINGS STARTED

Access to Secret Data
Denied Nuclear Expert
—Red Ties Alleged

Texts of charges and reply by
Oppenheimer, Pages 16, 17, 18.

By JAMES RESTON

Special to The New York Times.

WASHINGTON, April 12—Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer, the man who directed the making of the first atomic bomb, has been suspended by the Atomic Energy Commission pending a review of his security file.

A panel of the commission's Personnel Security Board, headed by Gordon Gray, president of the University of North Carolina and former Secretary of the Army, started hearings on the case today.

The other members of the three-man panel are Thomas Morgan, former chairman and president of the Sperry Corporation, and Ward V. Evans, Professor of Chemistry at Loyola University of Chicago.

Meanwhile Dr. Oppenheimer, who directed the Government's atomic bomb project at Los Alamos, N. M., in World War II, and now carries around in his head as much top secret information as any man alive, has been denied access to all Government security documents.

Charges Are Listed


The main charges against him—most of which had been reviewed by the A. E. C., the White House, and the Departments of Justice, State and Defense over a period of twelve years—were that he:


① Associated frequently with Communists in the early Forties, including his brother Frank and Frank's wife; that he fell in love with one Communist and married another former Communist; and that he contributed regularly and generously to Communist causes from 1940 to April of 1942.

② Hired Communists or former Communists at Los Alamos during the war.


③ Gave contradictory testimony to the Federal Bureau of Investigation about attendance at Communist meetings in the early Nineteen Forties.

④ Attempted as "traitorous" an attempt by an alleged Communist to get scientific information from him for the Soviet Union, but failed to report the incident to the Government's security officials.





Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer



headed by the Atomic Energy Commission pending a review of his security file.

A panel of the commission's Personnel Security Board, headed by Gordon Gray, president of the University of North Carolina and former Secretary of the Army, started hearings on the case today.

The other members of the three-man panel are Thomas Morgan, former chairman and president of the Sperry Corporation, and Ward V. Evans, Professor of Chemistry at Loyola University of Chicago.

Meanwhile Dr. Oppenheimer, who directed the Government's atomic bomb project at Los Alamos, N. M., in World War II, and now carries around in his head as much top secret information as any man alive, has been denied access to all Government security documents.

Charges Are Listed

The main charges against him—most of which had been reviewed by the A. E. C., the White House, and the Departments of Justice, State and Defense over a period of twelve years—were that he:

①Associated frequently with Communists in the early Forties, including his brother Frank and Frank's wife; that he fell in love with one Communist and married another former Communist; and that he contributed regularly and generously to Communist causes from 1940 to April of 1942.

②Hired Communists or former Communists at Los Alamos during the war.

③Gave contradictory testimony to the Federal Bureau of Investigation about attendance at Communist meetings in the early Nineteen Forties.

④Rejected as "unreliable" an attempt by an alleged Communist to get scientific information from him for the Soviet Union, but failed to report the incident to the Government's security officers for many months.

⑤Strongly opposed the development of the hydrogen bomb in 1945, when he was chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission's General Advisory Committee, and lobbied against it even after President Truman ordered the A. E. C. to proceed with the project.

Dr. Oppenheimer, who has repeatedly admitted association with various Communists in the late Thirties and early Forties but flatly denied membership in

Continued on Page 15, Column 1

00-319368-22



DAILY NEWS

NEW YORK'S PICTURE NEWSPAPER



Vol. 35. No. 250

Copyright 1964 News Syndicate Co. Inc.

New York 17, N.Y., Tuesday, April 13, 1964

4¢ in city 15¢ OUTSIDE CITY LIMITS

OPPENHEIMER A-BOMB CHIEF SUSPENDED

A DUMB DUMB

SUSPENDED.

U. S. Board Studies Charges Scientist Had Commie Ties

By JERRY GREENE
of the News Bureau

Washington, D.C., April 12—Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer, world-famous atomic scientist who urged the United States not to build the H-bomb, has been suspended by the Atomic Energy Commission and denied access to secret information pending a thorough review of his past Communist associations.

Special hearings on the long security file of Oppenheimer, who directed work on the world's first atomic bomb at Los Alamos, N.M., began today.

SUSPENDED

U. S. Board Studies Charges Scientist Had Commie Ties

By JERRY GREENE

of the News Bureau

Washington, D.C., April 12—Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer, world-famous atomic scientist who urged the United States not to build the H-bomb, has been suspended by the Atomic Energy Commission and denied access to secret information pending a thorough review of his past Communist associations.

Special hearings on the long security file of Oppenheimer, who directed work on the world's first atomic bomb at Los Alamos, N.M., began today.

They are being conducted by the AEC's Personnel Security Board headed by former Army Secretary Gordon Gray, now president of the University of North Carolina.

Pending a final determination of charges against him, Oppenheimer has been denied authority to see any government security documents.

The 50-year-old scientist's term as chairman of the General Advisory Committee of

Continued on page 2

SUSPENDS OPPENHEIMER

From Page 1

st party, is a sensi-
50 years of age.
his wife and two
in a big white
use on the grounds
tute for Advanced
inceton, N. J., where

to his work there.
his suspension, a
President Eisenhower
Advisory Committee,
the A. E. C., and
the Departments of
the and the National
Council on armaments
regulation, continental
defense, and the use
apons in support of

heimer, in a forty-
answer to the charges
denied that he had
nt the hydrogen
ment after President
ordered its develop-
t he had given any
ation to any unau-

deny his past Com-
ciations or early
ertain philosophic
Communist ideolo-
he asserted that he
ed his illusions about
during the war.
asked that the "de-
ormation" in his file
the context of his
nd work.

this life, when he
or at the University
and the California
Technology, Dr.
said:

s, both in Pasadena
eley, were mostly
e, scientists, classi-
ists. I studied and
with Arthur Rider,
widely, but mostly
is, plays and poetry;
something of other

atomic warheads for guided mis-
siles and atomic artillery.

Some of the scientists on the
advisory committee at that time
—it is understood Dr. Oppen-
heimer agreed with them—did
have moral and political reasons
for opposing the hydrogen bomb
program.

Wanted New Negotiation

Chairman Lillenthal of the
A. E. C. felt, for example, that
another attempt should be made
to negotiate a world agreement
for the control of atomic weapons
before proceeding with "the super."
He also thought that a deci-
sion to build the A-bomb would
perpetuate what he regarded as
the illusion that the bigger wea-
pon was a substitute for an all-
around military program, which
was hampered at that time by an
economy wave.

If Dr. Oppenheimer had any
political or moral reservations
about the hydrogen bomb pro-
gram, however, he did not men-
tion them in his reply to the
Atomic Commission.

There are two different stories
about how the Oppenheimer case
was revived at this time. The
first is that a former employe of
the Joint (Congressional) Com-
mittee on Atomic Energy, who
had opposed Dr. Oppenheimer's
position on the development of
the hydrogen bomb in 1949, went
to the present head of the Joint
Committee, Representative W.
Sterling Cole, Republican of up-
state New York, with a long
catalogue of charges against Dr.
Oppenheimer, and that Mr. Cole
took up the matter with the
White House.

The other, and more generally
accepted version, is that the
F. B. I. itself sent a summary of
the charges in its Oppenheimer
file to President Eisenhower and
questioned the prudence of allow-
ing a person with such Commu-
nist associations in the past to
have access to top secret infor-
mation.

It is understood that the Presi-
dent discussed the matter with
the Secretary of Defense, Charles
E. Wilson, the Director of the
Office of Defense Mobilization,
Arthur S. Flemming, and his as-



At New York Times

HEADS INQUIRY: Gordon Gray of the Atomic Energy Commission's Personnel Security Board, who has started hearings on the case of Dr. Robert J. Oppenheimer.

and that the last payment was
apparently made in April, 1942,
immediately before your entry
into the atomic bomb project.

DR. OPPENHEIMER — The
matter which most engaged my
sympathies and interests was the
war in Spain . . . It was prob-
ably through Spanish relief ef-
forts that I met Dr. Thomas
Addis and Rudy Lambert . . .
Addis asked me, perhaps in the
winter of 1937-38, to contribute
through him to the Spanish
cause. He made clear that this
money, unlike that which went
to the relief organizations, would
go straight to the fighting effort,
and that it would go through
Communist channels.

ty memberships; they were on
again, off again. . . . and
never seemed to provide for her
what she was seeking.

I don't believe that her inter-
ests were really political. She
was a person of deep religious
feeling. She loved this country
and its people and its life. She
was, as it turned out, a friend of
many fellow-travelers and Com-
munists, with a number of whom
I was later to become acquaint-
ed. [However] I should not give
the impression that it was wholly
because of Jean Tallock that I
made left-wing friends . . . I
have mentioned some of the other
contributing causes. I like the
new sense of companionship, and
at the time felt that I was com-
ing to be part of the life of my
time and country. . . .

Reports Wife Was Ex-Red

QUESTION NO. 4: It was re-
ported that your wife, Katherine
Puening Oppenheimer, was for-
merly the wife of Joseph Dallet,
a member of the Communist
party, who was killed in Spain in
1937 fighting for the Spanish Re-
publican Army. It was further
reported that during the period
of her association with Joseph
Dallet your wife became a mem-
ber of the Communist party.

DR. OPPENHEIMER—It was
in the summer of 1939, in Pasa-
dena that I first met my wife.
She was married to Dr. Harrison,
who was a friend and associate
of the Tolmans, Lauriteens and
others on the California Institute
of Technology faculty.

I learned of her earlier mar-
riage to Joe Dallet and of his
death fighting in Spain. He had
been a Communist party official
and for a year or two during their
brief marriage, my wife was a
Communist party member.

When I met her, I found
her a deep loyalty to her for-
husband, a complete diseng-
ment from any political act
and a certain disappointmen-
contempt that the Comm-
party was not in fact what
once thought it was.

The scientist also told
A. E. C.'s security board that

the fact of the Security Board
hearings become public.

Among those who have been
in on the secret there are two
contradictory views. The first is
that the Gordon Gray Security
Board will find, as the Atomic
Energy Commission found in
1947, that Dr. Oppenheimer's
Communist associations before
1943 do not make him a "security
risk" in 1954, and that his con-
tributions to the ending of the
war and to the success of the
"cold war" outweigh any of his
pre-1943 actions.

Stand on H-Bomb Scanned

The other view is that some of
the policies he has favored since
the end of the war still raise
some question about his loyalty.
For example, recent appeals for
more information on the hydro-
gen bomb and his opposition to it.

It is generally agreed here that
the judgment of many prominent
persons is on trial in this case.
Dr. Oppenheimer was recom-
mended for his Los Alamos job,
for example, by General Leslie
Groves, Dr. Bush and Dr. James
B. Conant.

His F. B. I. file, containing all
these charges, has been open to
the Joint Congressional Commi-
tee ever since that committee was
formed eight years ago; most
of the members of the present
Atomic Energy Commission have
known this whole story for years.

And Dr. Oppenheimer was called
to the White House to advise the
highest policy-making body in
the land—the National Security
Council—on continental defense
policy last summer.

The physicist began his reply
to the commission by saying
"though of course I would have
no desire to retain an advisory
position if my advice were not
needed. I cannot ignore the ques-
tion [of possible disloyalty] you
have raised, nor accept the sug-
gestion that I am unfit for pub-
service."

He ended it by saying:
"I have had to deal briefly or
not at all with instances in which
my actions or views were ad-
verse to Soviet or Communist

interest, and of actions that tes-
tify to my devotion to freedom;
or that have contributed to the
vitality, influence and power
of the United States.

"In preparing this letter, I have
reviewed two decades of my life.
I have recalled instances when
I acted unwisely. What I hope
was, not that I could wholly
avoid error, but that I might
learn from it. What I have learn-
has, I think, made me more
to serve my country."



...particularly in the Republic... against Gen. Francisco... in the Spanish Civil War... he developed many left... associations and contributed to the Communist... for the... Republicans... often in sums over \$100.

"Because of these associations... and the contributions," he said, "I might well have appeared at the time as quite close to the Communist party—perhaps even, as some people, as belonging to it."

"As I have said, some of its declared objectives seemed to me desirable. But I never was a member of the Communist party. I never accepted Communist dogma or theory. In fact, it never made sense to me."

"I had no clearly formulated political views. I hated tyranny and repression and every form of dictatorial control of thought. In most cases, I did not in those days know who was and who was not a member of the Communist party. No one ever asked me to join the Communist party."

The question raised about Dr. Oppenheimer's position on the hydrogen bomb was phrased by the A. E. C. in these terms: "It was reported (presumably in the F. B. I.) that in the autumn of 1941, 1949 and subsequently, you strongly opposed the development of the hydrogen bomb (1) on moral grounds; (2) by claiming that it was not feasible; (3) by claiming that there were insufficient facilities and scientific personnel to carry on the development; and (4) that it was not politically desirable."

Dr. Oppenheimer replied that he and the other members of the general advisory committee of the A. E. C. had opposed what was called a "crash program" to produce "the super"—the code name for the hydrogen bomb project.

Questioned by Lillenthal

In October of 1949, he said, after the Soviet Union's first atomic explosion, Chairman David E. Lillenthal of the A. E. C. had called in the commission's general advisory committee, of which Dr. Oppenheimer was the chairman, and asked these questions:

"In view of the Soviet success, was the commission's program adequate, and if not how should it be altered?"

"Should a 'crash program' for the development of 'the super' be a part of any new program?"

Rear Admiral Lewis L. Strauss, who was then on the commission but not chairman of it, had circulated a memorandum urging the development of the Super as fast as possible, but the General Advisory Committee took another view.

Dr. Oppenheimer did not spell out why the committee, including himself, opposed the "crash" program. In his letter to the A. E. C. he referred the Government to the advisory committee's report at that time.

However, it is understood that he also put in evidence another secret document in the form of a memorandum about the decision of the advisory committee at that time. According to this memorandum, Dr. Oppenheimer and several other members of the advisory committee took this view:

"In view of the Soviet atom-bomb explosion, the United States defense program was not sufficient."

"New designs of weapons calculated to increase the family of atomic weapons should be pressed at once."

"Particularly, the 'field component' of the weapons should be improved. More attention should be paid to the project for developing

...to the commission by the F. B. I. The Admiral later was responsible for the selection of Dr. Oppenheimer as director of the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton.

Admiral Strauss is understood to have given Dr. Oppenheimer the choice of resigning or facing security charges. This was on Dec. 31, 1953. Dr. Oppenheimer stated then, and wrote a letter the next day repeating, that he preferred to face the charges.

As a result, Maj. Gen. K. D. Nichols, the general manager of the Atomic Energy Commission, wrote a letter on Dec. 22, 1953, which raised the derogatory information in Dr. Oppenheimer's file and explained "the steps which you may take to assist in the resolution of this question."

This letter explained that, under the MacArthur Administration's new security regulations (Executive Order 10450), it was mandatory that a Government employee be suspended and his eligibility to see security information denied where there existed in his file "information indicating that his employment may not be clearly consistent with the interests of national security."

This particular part of the letter seemed to suggest that the review of the case was more or less routine—an automatic check of old information to make sure that it conformed to the Eisenhower Administration's new security regulations.

The Nichols letter added, however: "As a result of additional investigation as to your character, associations and loyalty... there has developed considerable question whether your continued employment on Atomic Energy Commission work will endanger the common defense and security and whether such continued employment is clearly consistent with the interests of national security."

"In view of your access to highly sensitive classified information, and in view of these allegations which, until disproved, raise questions as to your veracity, conduct and even your loyalty, the commission has no other recourse, in discharge of its obligations to protect the common defense and security but to suspend your clearance until the matter has been resolved."

Altogether, the A. E. C.'s letter raised over twenty different questions about Dr. Oppenheimer's conduct, associations, veracity and loyalty. The commission explained to Dr. Oppenheimer that the A. E. C. was not vouching for or giving the sources of these charges, but merely passing them along to Dr. Oppenheimer to clear up.

The New York Times obtained a detailed report of these charges and sought verification from Dr. Oppenheimer. Admiral Strauss and Chairman Cole of the Congressional Atomic Energy Committee.

In view of the fact that the Times was in possession of most of the facts in the case, Dr. Oppenheimer made the statement of charges and his reply available to The Times so that the record of the case could be written from the actual documents.

Charges and Replies

Accordingly, here are the main charges which were passed on to Dr. Oppenheimer in the A. E. C.'s letter and the replies given by Dr. Oppenheimer to the commission:

QUESTION NO. 1—It was reported (presumably to the F. B. I.) that prior to April, 1943, you had contributed \$150 per month to the Communist party in the San Francisco area

Peter Ivanov, Secretary of the Soviet Consulate, San Francisco, approached Dr. Oppenheimer for information regarding work being done by the Radiation Laboratory, that George Elton... subsequently requested Haakon Chevalier to approach you concerning this matter; that Haakon Chevalier thereupon approached you, either directly or through your brother, Frank Friedman; that Haakon Chevalier finally advised George Elton that there was no chance whatsoever of obtaining the information... I knew of no attempt to obtain secret information at Los Alamos. Prior to my going there, my friend, Haakon Chevalier, with his wife, visited us on Eagle Hill, probably in early 1943. During the visit he came into the kitchen and told me that George Elton had spoken to him of the possibility of obtaining technical information to Soviet scientists.

I made some strong remark to the effect that this sounded terribly wrong to me. The discussion ended there. Nothing in our long-standing friendship would have led me to believe that Chevalier was actually seeking information; and I was certain that he had no idea of the work at which I was engaged... It has long been clear to me that I should have reported this incident at once... Later, when General Groves (Maj. Gen. Leslie Groves, Army officer in charge of the atom bomb project) urged me to give the details, I told him of my conversation with Chevalier. I still think of Chevalier as a friend."

Asked About Dr. Tatlock

QUESTION NO. 2—It was reported that 1943 and previously, you were intimately associated with Dr. Jean Tatlock, a member of the Communist party in San Francisco, and that Dr. Tatlock was partially responsible for your association with Communist front groups.

DR. OPPENHEIMER—In the spring of 1938, I had been introduced by friends to Jean Tatlock, the daughter of a noted Professor of English at the University of California; and in the autumn I began to court her, and we grew close to each other. We were at least twice close enough to marriage to think of ourselves as engaged.

Between 1939 and her death in 1944, I saw her very rarely. She told me about her Communist par-

The physician connections or sympathies did not necessarily disqualify a man from employment at Los Alamos if we had confidence in his integrity and dependability as a man.

Denies Disrupting Bomb

He denied, however, that he had talked about the atomic bomb to Communist party members during this period (1942-43) or that he knew in 1943 "several individuals" then at Los Alamos who had been members of the Communist party.

He knew of only one, he said.

"She was my wife... disassociation from... and of whose integrity and loyalty to the United States I had no question."

Later, in 1944 or 1945, he recalled, his brother Frank, also a physicist, came to Los Alamos from the atom-bomb project at Oak Ridge, Tenn., where he had been cleared for security.

Though one of the charges against Dr. Oppenheimer was that his opposition to the hydrogen bomb had slowed down its development—a charge recently implied by Senator Joseph R. McCarthy—the story unfolded in these remarkable documents indicates that Dr. Oppenheimer actually had a lot to do with the concept of the hydrogen bomb in the first place.

He tells how he called together a theoretical study group at Berkeley in the summer of 1942 and how this group "came to grips for the first time with the physical problems of atom bombs, atomic explosions and the possibility of using fission explosions to initiate thermonuclear (hydrogen) reactions."

At the end of this study, Dr. Oppenheimer said that he called the attention of Dr. Vannevar Bush to the possibility of hydrogen bomb reactions, and that it was then that "we began to see the great explosions of Alamos, Gordo... with a surer foreknowledge."

Left-Wing Ties Mooted

It was about that same time, late summer of 1942, that the first question of his left-wing associations was raised, but it was indicated to him then, as it was many times later, that these past associations would not be allowed to stand in the way of the work he was doing to develop the "decisive weapon" of the war.

Nevertheless, it is a fact that those who have been privy to the secret of the "Oppenheimer Case" are now wondering what the political reaction here will be when

both in Pasadena...
...were mostly...
...scientists, classi-
...I studied and...
...with Arthur Rider...
...widely, but mostly...
...s, plays and poetry...
...something of other...
...ce.
...Interested in and...
...about economics or...
...almost wholly di-
...the contemporary...
...country. I never...
...paper or a current...
...Time or Harper's...
...lo, no telephone; I...
...the stock market...
...fall of 1929 only...
...the event: the first...
...voted was in the...
...lection of 1936...
...n War in Spain
...meier explained to...
...that he later began...
...interest in political...
...ticularly in the Re-
...ttle against Gen...
...anco in the Spanish...
...nd that he developed...
...ing associations and...
...to the Communists...
...ish Republicans—...
...s over \$100.
...of these associations...
...he contributions," he...
...it well have appeared...
...as quite close to the...
...ple—perhaps even...
...le, as belonging to it...
...e said, some of its de-
...tives seemed to me...
...But I never was a...
...he Communist party...
...accepted Communist...
...eory; in fact, it never...
...to me.
...o clearly formulated...
...ws. I hated tyranny...
...on and every form of...
...ontrol of thought. In...
...I did not in those...
...who was and who was...
...ner of the Communist...
...one ever asked me to...
...mmunist party."
...tion raised about Dr...
...r's position on the...
...omb was phrased by...
...letter in these terms...
...reported (presumably...
...s. I.) that in the au-
...1941, 1949 and subse-
...strongly opposed the...
...t of the hydrogen...
...n moral grounds: (2)...
...that it was not fea-
...sible claiming that there...
...cient facilities and

have access to top secret infor-
mation.
It is understood that the Presi-
dent discussed the matter with
the Secretary of Defense, Charles
E. Wilson, the Director of the
Office of Defense Mobilization,
Arthur S. Flemming, and his as-
sistant on National Security
Council matters Gen. Robert Cut-
ler before calling in Admiral
Strauss, the A. E. C. chairman.
Asked to Meet Strauss
This was in December of 1953,
during the controversy over how
former President Truman had
dealt with F. B. I. security warn-
ings in the Harry Dexter White
case. Whether this affected the
decision is not known, but in any
event a decision was made to pro-
ceed with the case.
Accordingly, Dr. Oppenheimer
was asked to meet Admiral
Strauss, who had been a member
of the commission in 1947, when
the Oppenheimer file was first
sent to the commission by the
F. B. I. The Admiral later was re-
sponsible for the selection of Dr.
Oppenheimer as director of the
Institute for Advanced Study in
Princeton.
Admiral Strauss is understood
to have given Dr. Oppenheimer
the choice of resigning or facing
security charges. This was on
Dec. 21, 1953. Dr. Oppenheimer
stated then, and wrote a letter
the next day repeating, that he
preferred to face the charges.
As a result, Maj. Gen. K. D.
Nichols, the general manager of
the Atomic Energy Commission,
wrote a letter on Dec. 23, 1953
which listed the derogatory in-
formation in Dr. Oppenheimer's
file and explained "the steps
which you may take to assist in
the resolution of this question."
This letter explained that,
under the Eisenhower Adminis-
tration's new security regula-
tions (Executive Order 10450), it
was mandatory that a Govern-
ment employe be suspended and
his eligibility to see security in-
formation denied where there
existed in his file "information
indicating that his employment
may not be clearly consistent
with the interests of national se-
curity."
This particular part of the let-
ter seemed to suggest that the
review of the case was more or
less routine—an automatic check
of old information to make sure
that it conformed to the Eisen-
hower Administration's new se-

winner of 1937-35, to contribute
through him to the Spanish
cause. He made clear that this
money, unlike that which went
to the relief organizations, would
go straight to the fighting effort,
and that it would go through
Communist channels.
I did so contribute: usually
when he communicated with me,
explaining the nature of the need,
I gave him sums in cash, prob-
ably never much less than a hun-
dred dollars, and occasionally
perhaps somewhat more than
that, several times during the
winter. * * *
In time these contributions
came to an end. I went to a big
Spanish relief party the night
before Pearl Harbor. * * * I de-
cided that I had had about
enough of the Spanish cause, and
that there were other and more
pressing crises in the world.
QUESTION No. 2—It was re-
ported that prior to March 1,
1953, possibly three months prior,
Peter Ivanov, Secretary at the
Soviet Consulate, San Francisco,
approached George Charles El-
tenton for the purpose of obtain-
ing information regarding work
being done at the Radiation Lab-
oratory for the use of Soviet
scientists; that George Eltenton
subsequently requested Haakon
Chevalier to approach you con-
cerning this matter; that Haakon
Chevalier thereupon approached
you, either directly or through
your brother, Frank Friedman
Oppenheimer, in connection with
this matter; and that Haakon
Chevalier finally advised George
Charles Eltenton that there was
no chance whatsoever of obtain-
ing the information. * * *
DR. OPPENHEIMER—I knew
of no attempt to obtain secret
information at Los Alamos. Prior
to my going there, my friend,
Haakon Chevalier, with his wife,
visited us on Eagle Hill, probably
in early 1943. During the visit he
came into the kitchen and told
me that George Eltenton had
spoken to him of the possibility
of obtaining technical informa-
tion to Soviet scientists.
I made some strong remark to
the effect that this sounded ter-
ribly wrong to me. The discus-
sion ended there. Nothing in our
long-standing friendship would
have led me to believe that Cheva-
lier was actually seeking infor-
mation; and I was certain that
he had no idea of the work on
which I was engaged * * *
It has long been clear to me

husb. n. a complete riseng
ment from any political act
and a certain disappointmen
contempt that the Comm
party was not in fact what
on- thought it was.
The scientist also told
A. E. C.'s security board that
his brother, Frank, and his
brother's wife, Jackie, had been
members of the Communist party
for a time. Frank told him this,
he said, probably in 1937, but
came to Berkeley in the autumn
of 1941 and "made it clear to
me that he was no longer a mem-
ber of the Communist party."
Cites Recruiting Problems
Dr. Oppenheimer described in
his letter to the A. E. C. some of
the problems of recruiting men
to go into the New Mexico desert
to work on the atomic bomb
project there. He also described
the restrictions and the excite-
ment of life in that important
military compound.
The physicist said that "past
Communist connections or sym-
pathies did not necessarily dis-
qualify a man from employment
(at Los Alamos) if we had con-
fidence in his integrity and de-
pendability as a man."
Denies Discussing Bomb
He denied, however, that he
had talked about the atomic
bomb to Communist party mem-
bers during this period (1942-45)
or that he knew in 1943 "several
individuals then at Los Alamos
who had been members of the
Communist party."
He knew of only one, he said.
"She was my wife,
disassociation from
and of whose integrity and loy-
alty to the United States I had
no question."
Later, in 1944 or 1945, he re-
called, his brother Frank, also a
physicist, came to Los Alamos
from the atom-bomb project at
Oak Ridge, Tenn., where he had
been cleared for security.
Though one of the charges
against Dr. Oppenheimer was
that his opposition to the hydro-
gen bomb had slowed down its
development—a charge recently
implied by Senator Joseph R. Mc-
Carthy—the story unfolded in
these remarkable documents in-
dicates that Dr. Oppenheimer ac-
tually had a lot to do with the
concept of the hydrogen bomb in
the first place.
He tells how he called together
a theoretical study group at

service."
He ended it by saying:
"I have had to deal briefly or
at all with instances in which
my actions or views were ad-
verse to Soviet or Communist

Oppenheimer A-project aide revealed as one-time Commie

WASHINGTON (JNS)—Official records disclosed yesterday that a top aide to Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer at Los Alamos, with access to virtually all A-bomb secrets, was by his own admission a Communist Party member until shortly before he went to work on the atomic project.

The man is Prof. David Hawkins of Boulder, Colo., who was Oppenheimer's administrative aide at Los Alamos and later historian of the undertaking which produced the first atomic bomb.

Ironically, Hawkins, as administrative chief, wrote the security regulations which imposed rigid restrictions on all personnel involved in the 1943 A-bomb development program at Los Alamos.

COMMITTEE TESTIMONY

Hawkins' admissions of communism and his description of his work at Los Alamos are contained in records of testimony he gave before the House Un-American Activities Committee in 1950 and before the Senate Internal Security Committee in 1953.

The charges on which Oppenheimer now is facing a security probe before a special Atomic Energy Commission panel include mention of Hawkins as one of five Communists the scientist allegedly was responsible for employing on the A-bomb project.

In his reply to the Hawkins charge, Oppenheimer told the AEC that Hawkins was hired at the suggestion of the Los Alamos personnel director. He added: "I understood that he had had left-wing associations; but it was not until in March of 1951 . . . that I knew about his membership in the Communist Party."

Chairman Velde (R-Ill.) said yesterday his House Un-American Activities Committee is "considering" the public release of secret testimony given by Dr. Oppenheimer in 1949, the United Press reported.

EXCERPTS RELEASED

Following are excerpts from Hawkins' testimony before the Un-American Activities Committee:

Q. "Would you state to the committee, please, the circumstances

under which you affiliated with the (Communist) Party and where and when it took place?"

A. "As nearly as I can recollect, I joined the Communist Party in Berkeley (Calif.) in 1938; I think the fall of 1938. I am not too precise about the date. I left the Communist Party in the spring of 1943."

Q. "Will you tell us the character of your employment at Los Alamos?"

A. "I find it difficult to explain the nature of my job. It was called administrative aide. My job was, roughly, to do all of the things that needed to be done and for which there was no regular administrative officer available. I was a sort of handy man or trouble shooter in an administrative capacity."

FIRST JOB

Q. "What were some of the fields in which you worked while you were there? And you were there from 1943 to 1946, I understand?"

A. "That is right. My first job, I well remember, was in connection with the draft deferment of some of the younger members of the scientific staff . . . another job I had at this time was drafting a book of regulations for people who worked in the laboratory. The rules were established, but they were not codified. For example, we had restrictions on travel at Los Alamos."

Q. "For security reasons?"

A. "Yes . . ."

Q. "As administrative assistant, who was your superior?"

A. "Mr. Oppenheimer."

Q. "Mr. Frank Oppenheimer?" (Frank Oppenheimer, Robert Oppenheimer's brother, is an admitted ex-Communist.)

A. "No. Mr. Robert Oppenheimer . . ."

Here are excerpts from Hawkins'

testimony before the Internal Security Committee:

Q. " . . . When did you discontinue your membership in the Communist Party?"

A. "I discontinued it in early 1943."

Q. "In what month?"

A. "I'm not exactly sure of the time because there was no definite single act of termination. I simply left; but I believe it was in March of that year."

Q. "In other words, it was no definite break on your part with the Communists?"

A. "I simply stopped going to meetings and paying dues . . ."

Q. "When did you first hear of the atomic bomb project and of the prospective work at Los Alamos?"

RECEIVED CALL

A. "About the first week of May, 1953 . . . I received a telephone call . . . (and) I spoke with Mr. Robert Oppenheimer, who is the director of the Los Alamos project."

Q. "Had you met Mr. Robert Oppenheimer prior to this . . .?"

A. "Yes, I had known him before that."

Q. "Had you met him through his brother, Frank Oppenheimer?"

A. "I'm not sure of the first time I met him. It's possible."

Q. "Now, you were invited to join the Los Alamos project?"

A. "I was so invited."

Q. "Mr. Hawkins, to what knowledge did you have access prior to V-J Day in connection with the Los Alamos project?"

A. "Prior to V-J Day, I had just entered my job as historian. I therefore had access to all the information that was necessary to write the history of the Los Alamos project."

NEWARK STAR LEADER

NEWARK, N. J.

DATE 4-19-54 PAGE 4

SUBMITTED BY THE NEWARK FIELD DIVISION

<input type="checkbox"/> SAC	<input type="checkbox"/> S #1
<input type="checkbox"/> ASAC	<input type="checkbox"/> S #2
<input type="checkbox"/> PA	<input type="checkbox"/> S #3
<input type="checkbox"/> C #1	<input type="checkbox"/> TRAIN
<input type="checkbox"/> C #2	<input type="checkbox"/> NA
<input type="checkbox"/> C #3	<input type="checkbox"/> C. CLERK
<input type="checkbox"/> ADD	<input type="checkbox"/> S. CLERK

SEARCHED	INDEXED
SERIALIZED	FILED
APR 19 1954	
FBI - NEWARK	

100-319368-2

T. Kelly

Top A-Scientist Oppenheimer Suspended; Study Commie Ties

(Continued from page 2)

formation to any unauthorized person.

Oppenheimer did not deny certain post-Communist associations but declared he had given up any illusions he might have had regarding Communism during World War II days.

He also denied he ever lobbied against the development of the H-bomb after President Truman gave the go-ahead for its construction in 1950.

Chief Accusations

The chief accusations against the scientist included: That he often associated with Communists in the past; that he hired Communists or ex-Communists at the Los Alamos plant; that he opposed development of the hydrogen bomb in 1949, and that he once gave contradictory testimony to the FBI concerning attendance at Communist meetings.

Another charge against him involved an incident in which he allegedly once rejected an offer by a reputed Communist to get information from him for Russia.



David E. Lilienthal
Former head of AEC.

he and other members of the General Advisory Committee opposed what he described as a "crash program" to embark on the H-bomb project.

Was the Wilson Middle

Following Russia's first atomic explosion, when former AEC Chairman David E. Lilienthal called in the Advisory Committee to ask whether work on the H-bomb should not then be started, Oppenheimer did not explain why he and the committee still opposed the so-called "crash program." He merely referred the AEC to the report of the committee already in existence.

It is believed the formal charges were laid against the scientist after an FBI report to President Eisenhower which questioned the advisability of permitting anyone with past Communist associations to have access to top secret data.

The President reportedly bud- dled with Defense Secretary Wilson and other ranking advisers last December with the result that Oppenheimer conferred with AEC Chairman Lewis L. Strauss who told him he could either resign from the Advisory Committee or answer to a security investigation.

Oppenheimer preferred to face the charges.

He then received a letter from Maj. Gen. E. D. Nichols, general manager of the AEC, listing the derogatory information catalogued in his file. It also explained that under the Eisenhower administration's new security measures a government employee must in such a case be suspended and his access to secret information denied.

Question of Security

The AEC communication also stated there was a question as to whether Oppenheimer's association with the AEC program would jeopardize the nation's defense and security.

Oppenheimer claimed that years

Oppenheimer In Capital

From THE NEWS Bureau

Washington, D. C., Tuesday, April 13.—Dr. Oppenheimer was in Washington today, and will stay on for further appearances in the AEC "proceedings" against him. The scientist has engaged an attorney to help in his defense.

ago, as a professor of the California Institute of Technology and the University of California, he was not interested in politics or economics.

It was not until the days of the Spanish Civil War of the late 1930s, he said, that he became interested in politics. It was then that he associated with left-wingers and donated cash to the Communist-supported Spanish Republicans in their war against Generalissimo Francisco Franco.

Oppenheimer admitted he might have seemed close to the Communist organization then but reiterated that he never had joined the party.

The scientist, who in 1945 urged



Maj. Gen. E. D. Nichols
General manager for AEC.

then neglected to report the matter to government security officials for months.

Still further, the security board charged Oppenheimer's association with Communists in the early 1940s resulted in his falling in love with one Communist and then marrying an ex-Communist. He also was alleged to have made regular contributions to Red causes.

Denies Disclosures

The physicist denied, however, that he ever discussed the A-bomb in the presence of Communist Party members during this period. As to whether he knew of any ex-party members being stationed at Los Alamos, he replied that he had known only one—his wife. He added that he did not question her loyalty to the U. S. or her disassociation from Communist ranks.

Oppenheimer repeatedly has denied he ever was a member of the Communist Party. He admitted, however, having had sympathies with some objectives of the Communist ideology, but asked that any derogatory information in his file be expunged in relation to his life and work.

His life and work in the Atomic Age has made him an extremely important individual to the security of the U. S. for he has an intimate knowledge and full understanding of the atomic bomb and all other



Secretary of Defense Wilson
In budle over Oppenheimer

that America offer joint control of atomic weapons to the Soviet Union because he thought it would help avoid war, told the AEC Security Board that he once came close to marrying Jean Tatlock, the late daughter of a well-known University of California English professor, during the period in which he made many left-wing acquaintances.

Miss Tatlock was identified as a Communist, and Oppenheimer later married Katherine Puening, who once was wed to Joseph Dallet, a Communist who was killed in the Spanish War. During his wife's brief first marriage she was a party member, the scientist said. He said his brother Frank had been a party member "long ago."

Oppenheimer a Scientist When He Was 11 Years Old

Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer was born in New York City, April 22, 1904, the son of a German immigrant. At the age of 11, Oppenheimer was elected a member of the New York Mineralogical Society. The next youngest member of the society was a man in his 60s.

tells it—his life had been almost monkish in the seclusion with which he pursued his studies. He owned no radio, read no newspapers—had not even heard about the stock market of 1929 until long after once had begun to paddle

Gratifying testimony to the FBI concerning attendance at Communist meetings.

Another charge against him involved an incident in which he allegedly was rejected on a report by a reputed Communist to get information from him for Russia.



Maj. Gen. K. D. Nichols
General manager for AEC.

then reported to report the matter to government security officials for months.

Still further, the security board charged Oppenheimer's association with Communists in the early 1940s resulted in his falling in love with one Communist and then marrying an ex-Communist. He also was alleged to have made regular contributions to Red causes.

Denies Discussions

The physicist denied, however, that he ever discussed the A-bomb in the presence of Communist Party members during this period. As to whether he knew of any ex-party members being stationed at Los Alamos, he replied that he had known only one—his wife. He added that he did not question her loyalty to the U. S. or her disassociation from Communist ranks.

Oppenheimer repeatedly has denied he ever was a member of the Communist Party. He admitted, however, having had sympathies with some objectives of the Communist ideology, but asked that any derogatory information in his files be appraised in relation to his life and work.

His life and work in the Atomic Era has made him an extremely important individual to the security of the U. S., for he has an intimate knowledge and full understanding of the most secret data this country possesses.

As to Oppenheimer's stand with regard to the H-bomb, the AEC said: "It was reported that you strongly opposed the development of the hydrogen bomb on moral grounds; by claiming it was not feasible; by claiming there are insufficient facilities and scientific personnel to carry on this development; and that it was not politically desirable."

Oppenheimer's answer was that



David E. Lillenthal
Former head of AEC.

he and other members of the General Advisory Committee opposed what he described as a "crash program" to embark on the H-bomb project.

Cue the Wilson Huddle

Following Russia's first atomic explosion, when former AEC Chairman David E. Lillenthal called in the Advisory Committee to ask whether work on the H-bomb should not then be started, Oppenheimer did not explain why he and the committee still opposed the so-called "crash program." He merely referred the AEC to the report of the committee already in existence.

It is believed the formal charges were laid against the scientist after an FBI report to President Eisenhower which questioned the advisability of permitting anyone with past Communist associations to have access to top secret data.

The President reportedly huddled with Defense Secretary Wilson and other ranking advisers last December with the result that Oppenheimer conferred with AEC Chairman Lewis L. Strauss who told him he could either resign from the Advisory Committee or answer to a security investigation.

Oppenheimer preferred to face the charges.

He then received a letter from Maj. Gen. K. D. Nichols, general manager of the AEC, listing the derogatory information catalogued in his file. It also explained that under the Eisenhower administration's new security measures a government employee must in such a case be suspended and his access to secret information denied.

Question of Security

The AEC communication also stated there was a question as to whether Oppenheimer's association with the AEC program would jeopardize the nation's defense and security.

Oppenheimer claimed that years

that he associated with left-wing men and donated cash to the Communist-supported Spanish Republicans in their war against Generalissimo Francisco Franco.

Oppenheimer admitted he might have seemed close to the Communist organization then but reiterated that he never had joined the party.

The scientist, who in 1945 urged



Secretary of Defense Wilson
to huddle over Oppenheimer

that America offer joint control of atomic weapons to the Soviet Union because he thought it would help avoid war, told the AEC Security Board that he once came close to marrying Jean Tatlock, the late daughter of a well-known University of California English professor, during the period in which he made many left-wing acquaintances.

Miss Tatlock was identified as a Communist, and Oppenheimer later married Katherine Puening, who once was wed to Joseph Dallet, a Communist who was killed in the Spanish War. During his wife's brief first marriage she was a party member, the scientist said. He said his brother Frank had been a party member "long ago."

Oppenheimer a Scientist When He Was 11 Years Old

Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer was born in New York City, April 22, 1904, the son of a German immigrant. At the age of 11, Oppenheimer was elected a member of the New York Mineralogical Society. The next youngest member of the society was a man in his 60s.

At 18 he entered Harvard and completed a four-year course in three years. He was graduated with highest honors. He then studied for a year at Cambridge, England, and went on to Göttingen, Germany, to take his Ph. D.

Early in 1945 the Government called him away from his professorship of theoretical physics at the University of California to work on atomic research.

Up to that time—as he himself

tells it—his life had been almost monkish in the seclusion with which he pursued his studies. He owned no radio, read no newspapers—had not even heard about the stock market of 1929 until long after men had begun to peddle apples on street corners.

In 1945, shortly after the end of the war, he was introduced to the world as the "man who built the atom bomb," though he had done no pioneer work on fission.

In an end-of-the-war interview Oppenheimer disclosed that his laboratory at Los Alamos, N. M., had discovered how to use atomic energy at least a year and a half before the blast that leveled Hiroshima.

A-Scientist Loyal--Nixon

Vice President Says Only Security Should Bar Oppenheimer

WASHINGTON (AP)—Vice President Nixon was identified last night as the high Administration official who told newsmen that Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer of Princeton, N. J., "is a loyal American" and should not be barred from government work if he is not a security risk.

James Heston, Washington correspondent of The New York Times, named Nixon.

Nixon has had contact with the Oppenheimer case since 1949, when the physicist—who played a leading role in the development of the atomic bomb—was questioned by the House un-American activities committee. Nixon was a committee member at the time.

Nixon said Friday that "if the man is not a security risk, if he is not subject to blackmail, he should work for the government."

The decision rests with the panel now investigating his record, Nixon noted, and "I am sure Dr. Oppenheimer will get a fair hearing," Nixon said.

"Prima Facie' Case"

The Vice President, who has seen the full file on Oppenheimer, said:

"Dr. Oppenheimer, at least on the evidence I have seen, in my opinion, is a loyal American. On the other hand, the information in his file is voluminous and makes a 'prima facie' case of security risk."

Nixon said the big question posed by the Oppenheimer case

(Continued From First Page)

is whether the government should take the position that past associations, even if foresworn, should forever after preclude government employment.

"I do not believe it should," Nixon said, adding:

"I believe each case should be considered on its merits, particularly when dealing with an ideology which during the 1930s had such an appeal among the intelligentsia and various other groups."

Colleagues Warn

WASHINGTON (AP)—The Federation of American Scientists

charged yesterday that barring of Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer from atomic and hydrogen secrets jeopardizes continued contributions by science to vital government military and other programs.

The federation, of which Oppenheimer is a member, issued a statement which said:

"The unseating of any major public figure under such circumstances is bound to create confusion and shake the confidence of our people in their leadership."

"It is disturbing that old facts and alleged facts of belief and association, all relating to the period before Oppenheimer began his active public service, should now be incorporated in the attack against him."

<input type="checkbox"/> SAC	<input type="checkbox"/> S #1
<input type="checkbox"/> ASAC	<input type="checkbox"/> S #2
<input type="checkbox"/> PA	<input type="checkbox"/> S #3
<input type="checkbox"/> C #1	<input type="checkbox"/> TRAIN
<input type="checkbox"/> C #2	<input type="checkbox"/> NA
<input type="checkbox"/> C #3	<input type="checkbox"/> C. CLERK
<input type="checkbox"/> APPL	<input type="checkbox"/> S. STENO

NEWARK SUNDAY NEWS
Newark, New Jersey

Date 4-18-54 Page 1

SUBMITTED BY THE NEWARK FIELD DIVISION

100-31936-27

SEARCHED	INDEXED
SERIALIZED	FILED
APR 19 1954	
FBI - NEWARK	

T. Kelly

'Scientists 'shocked' at Oppenheimer ban

WASHINGTON (AP) — The Federation of American Scientists yesterday expressed shock at the barring of Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer from atomic secrets and said his case makes "essential" a speedy review of the entire security program.

The science group, in a statement issued by Dr. M. Stanley Livingston, chairman of the executive committee, said the government action "has relegated to official ostracism a distinguished scientist and citizen, long a confidential adviser in our innermost councils of government."

EXPRESS DISMAY

"The charge that his continued public service threatens the security of the United States has shocked the nation and the scientific community in particular," the national organization declared. It identifies itself as an organization of scientists representing all fields of science "who are concerned with the interaction of science and society."

Oppenheimer, who pioneered in the development of the first atomic bomb, was denied further

access to official secrets last December by presidential order. This was after the Atomic Energy Commission said it had received information that he was a security risk.

Oppenheimer denied this, and a special, three-man panel headed by former Army Secretary Gordon Gray is now weighing the case in secret sessions.

'LOYAL AMERICAN'

A top ranking administration official, who asked that his name not be used, declared he feels Oppenheimer is a "loyal American" and should not be barred from government work if he is not a security risk.

The official, who has been familiar with the Oppenheimer case since 1948 when the scientist was questioned by a congressional committee, said he had found Oppenheimer to be "cooperative, expressive and responsive" under questioning.

SUNDAY STAR LEDGER

NEWARK, N.J.

DATE 4-10-54 PAGE 2

SUBMITTED BY THE NEWARK FIELD DIVISION

<input type="checkbox"/> SAC	<input type="checkbox"/> S #1 ✓
<input type="checkbox"/> ASAC	<input type="checkbox"/> S #2
<input type="checkbox"/> PA	<input type="checkbox"/> S #3
<input type="checkbox"/> C #1	<input type="checkbox"/> TRAIN
<input type="checkbox"/> C #2	<input type="checkbox"/> NA
<input type="checkbox"/> C #3	<input type="checkbox"/> C. CLERK
<input type="checkbox"/> APPL	<input type="checkbox"/> S. STENO

SEARCHED.....	INDEXED.....
SERIALIZED.....	FILED.....
APR 10 1954	
FBI - NEWARK	

100-31936B-25

Oppenheimer role in world A-plan eyed

WASHINGTON (U.P.)—A special Atomic Energy Commission panel is looking into Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer's role in the U.S. plan for international control of atomic energy, it was learned yesterday.

The panel, headed by former Army Secretary Gordon Gray, is holding secret meetings on allegations that Oppenheimer, one of the nation's top atomic scientists, consorted with Communists in the past and delayed construction of the hydrogen bomb.

Oppenheimer has acknowledged contacts with Reds and former Reds but said he never was a Communist or gave secrets to Russia. He said he had some objections to the H-bomb but devoted all his energies to the project once former President Truman gave a go-ahead.

INQUIRY NEAR END

The hearings probably will conclude this week. The three-man panel will make its recommendations—possibly this week—to AEC general manager K. D. Nichols who will then rule on whether Oppenheimer's suspension as an atomic adviser will be lifted or made permanent.

Among distinguished witnesses called this week was Maj. Gen. Frederick Osborn of New York, formerly U.S. deputy representative on the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission.

Oppenheimer served on a committee headed by former AEC chairman David E. Lillienthal and former Secretary of State Dean Acheson that drew up the basic U. S. plan for worldwide atom control submitted to the UN by Bernard M. Baruch.

INSPECTION SYSTEM

The plan called for strict international control of all atomic weapons and means of producing them, providing an airtight inspection system was set up that would prevent any nation—including Russia—from building up a secret arsenal of atom weapons. The plan has gotten nowhere because Russia refused to accept such inspection.

Though details of this week's testimony are secret, a friend of Oppenheimer said, "It is a pity that these witnesses were not testifying in public."

They include Lillienthal and former AEC chairman Gordon Dean; Dr. Vannevar Bush, original supervisor of U. S. atomic development; Dr. I. I. Rabi of Columbia University, who succeeded Oppenheimer as chairman of the AEC's general advisory committee; Dr. Lee A. DuBridge of the California Institute of Technology, chairman of the President's National Science Council; Dr. James B. Conant, high commissioner for Germany.

NEWARK STAR LEDGER

NEWARK, N. J.

DATE 4-23-54 TIME 4

SUBMITTED BY THE NEWARK FIELD DIVISION

<input type="checkbox"/> SAC	<input type="checkbox"/> S #1
<input type="checkbox"/> ASAC	<input type="checkbox"/> S #2
<input type="checkbox"/> FA	<input type="checkbox"/> S #3
<input type="checkbox"/> C #1	<input type="checkbox"/> TRAIN
<input type="checkbox"/> C #2	<input type="checkbox"/> NA
<input type="checkbox"/> C #3	<input type="checkbox"/> C. CLERK
<input type="checkbox"/> ATPL	<input type="checkbox"/> S. STENO

SEARCHED	INDEXED
SERIALIZED	FILED
APR 23 1954	
FBI - NEWARK	

100-31936B-26

What Readers Have to Say

Protest Against "Double Standard of Political Morality" as Evincing by Security Program's Operation

To the Editor:

Sir—I have read your editorial on Dr. Oppenheimer, the account of the charges brought against him so seemingly trivial, most of them "shop-worn," based on the testimony of a paid informer of proven unreliability, and other comments. As one who myself sympathized with the Spanish Loyalists in their struggle against Franco, who, back in the 1930s hoped that the Russian experiment with Communism might eventually bring some measure of good to the Russian people, I find myself deeply disturbed by the necessity which even those who uphold Dr. Oppenheimer's loyalty feel to apologize for his past opinions and attitudes.

The phrase "a privilege, not a right to serve the government" has been used ad nauseam by officials in this Administration, in connection with the summary dismissal of more humble government workers. But now the long arm of the President's security program, the new broom sweeping so clean, has struck at one of our foremost scientists.

The "privilege" which he was allowed all during World War II of unremitting labor 24 hours a day in service to his country is denied him. A "blank wall" has been erected between his superb talents and his nation which never needed such talents more. In the light of this I wish to protest against what seems to me a

"double standard" of political morality, which makes certain opinions once held such evidence of unreliability.

Prior to World War II there were many people like the late Senator Taft and the late Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg, who were strongly isolationist in their views. Though sincere and patriotic Americans, such men were in large part responsible for the fact that we were so ill-equipped to meet the demands of the war when it came, and their shortsightedness undoubtedly prolonged it.

Mr. Vandenberg came to recognize this himself and in his last years devoted himself to the cause of internationalism. But though to Americans of greater vision who had realized the extent of the Nazi menace to our democratic way of life, these men may have seemed "fuzzy-minded" and "naive" in the extreme, no one ever suggested that they were thereby rendered unfit to serve their country, were, in short, "security risks."

Another even more striking example is that of an eminent American who, prior to our entry into the war, took a violently isolationist stand and became what Robert Sherwood, in his book, "Roosevelt and Hopkins," calls "one of the most forcible and persuasive, though unwitting, purveyors of Nazi propaganda." Many people will recall the speeches he made before crowds composed largely of Nazis, Coughlinites and Communists, wherein he warned his listeners that England's cause was lost, and came as near as any man in this century to urging Americans toward open revolt against their government.

The name of this man is Charles A. Lindbergh and in recent months he has been summoned to Washington for special Presidential honors and military promotion. I have no wish to criticize Lindbergh, who gave loyal service to his country once war was declared. But I do think it worth noting that Secretary of Defense Wilson did not compare him, as he did Oppenheimer, to an ex-convict who should reform somewhere else than in the Army. In fact, there is no record that any one even asked him if he had reformed!

(MRS.) ANN H. BEBOUT.
Cedar Grove.

NEWARK EVENING NEWS
Newark, New Jersey

Date 4-23-54 Page 22

SUBMITTED BY THE NEWARK FIELD DIVISION

100-31936-27

SEARCHED.....	INDEXED.....
SERIALIZED.....	FILED.....
APR 26 1954	
FBI NEWARK	

100-31936B-27

Oppenheimer probe studied

WASHINGTON 47.—A special three-man security board secretly investigating Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer recessed yesterday "to review the record" and possibly report their findings on the famed atomic scientist.

Dr. Gordon Gray, chairman of the board appointed by the Atomic Energy Commission to examine charges against Oppenheimer, known in scientific circles as "Mr. Atom," announced the recess in a two-sentence statement.

NEWARK STAR LEADER

NEWARK, N. J.

DATE 5-7-54 PAGE 1

SUBMITTED BY THE NEWARK FIELD DIVISION

<input type="checkbox"/> SAC	<input type="checkbox"/> S #1
<input type="checkbox"/> ASAC	<input type="checkbox"/> S #2
<input type="checkbox"/> PA	<input type="checkbox"/> S #3
<input type="checkbox"/> C #1	<input type="checkbox"/> TRAIN
<input type="checkbox"/> C #2	<input type="checkbox"/> NA
<input type="checkbox"/> C #3	<input type="checkbox"/> C. CLERK
<input type="checkbox"/> APPL	<input type="checkbox"/> S. STENO

100-319368-28

SEARCHED.....	INDEXED.....
SERIALIZED.....	FILED.....
MAY 7 - 1954	
FBI - NEWARK	

Oppenheimer victim --- Reds

NEW YORK (AP)—The Moscow Literary Gazette, in the first Soviet discussion of the Oppenheimer case, pictures the American atomic scientist as the innocent victim of Sen. McCarthy.

An editorial in a copy of the Soviet newspaper, reaching here yesterday, claimed the Oppenheimer affair marks the initiation of a general persecution of American scientists by "reactionaries."

Dr. Robert Oppenheimer, atomic physicist who was the top scientist figure in American development of the atomic bomb, has been temporarily deprived of his security clearance for access to government information on atomic energy while the question of renewal of the clearance is under study.

NEWARK STAR LEDGER

NEWARK, N. J.

DATE 5-10-54 PAGE 3

SUBMITTED BY THE NEWARK FIELD DIVISION

<input type="checkbox"/> SAC	<input type="checkbox"/> S #1
<input type="checkbox"/> ASAC	<input type="checkbox"/> S #2
<input type="checkbox"/> PA	<input type="checkbox"/> S #3
<input type="checkbox"/> C #1	<input type="checkbox"/> TRAIN
<input type="checkbox"/> C #2	<input type="checkbox"/> MA
<input type="checkbox"/> C #3	<input type="checkbox"/> C. CLERK
<input type="checkbox"/> ATPL	<input type="checkbox"/> S. STENO

100-319368-29

SEARCHED.....	INDEXED.....
SERIALIZED.....	FILED.....
MAY 10 1954	
FBI - NEWARK	

Info

Probe Seen Of Scientist

Congress May Inquire Into Loyalty of Oppenheimer

WASHINGTON (NS)—The possibility of a Congressional inquiry into the loyalty record of J. Robert Oppenheimer, mastermind of the atomic bomb, looms if he is ruled by an atomic energy personnel board to be a "security risk" to the United States.

There are indications that Congressional leaders expect the board will render its decision this week and permanently bar Dr. Oppenheimer from all atomic work in the "interests of national security."

When asked whether the Senate internal security committee plans an Oppenheimer inquiry, Senator William E. Jenner (R., Ind.), chairman, replied:

"Our policy is to wait and see what happens. We'll reach a decision once it's settled downtown."

Other reports were that the joint Congressional atomic energy committee might take over the inquiry but its chairman, Representative Sterling Cole (R., N. Y.), said:

"I have heard of no request for such a hearing."

Suspended in December

The noted scientist was suspended December 23 by Maj. Gen. K. D. Nichols, general manager of the AEC, on some of 20 charges of violating security. Aside from being accused of constantly associating with known Communists prior to working on the bomb, there was a major charge that Dr. Oppenheimer concealed for months a specific effort through mutual friends by a Soviet agent to acquire atomic secrets from him for "Soviet scientists."

Dr. Oppenheimer in his statement of defense, admitted the contact but declared he immediately repudiated the effort. After a few months, he warned intelligence officers of the contact and a bit later gave all details.

It is known that both government and defense could introduce new testimony at the AEC hearing. It may well be the government brought in new evidence on this Soviet effort to glean atomic secrets from the scientists.

NEWARK SUNDAY NEWS
Newark, New Jersey

Date 5-16-54 Page 5

SUBMITTED BY THE NEWARK FIELD DIVISION

<input type="checkbox"/> SAC	<input type="checkbox"/> S #1
<input type="checkbox"/> ASAC	<input type="checkbox"/> S #2
<input type="checkbox"/> PA	<input type="checkbox"/> S #3
<input type="checkbox"/> C #1	<input type="checkbox"/> TRAIN
<input type="checkbox"/> C #2	<input type="checkbox"/> A
<input type="checkbox"/> C #3	<input type="checkbox"/> CLENC
<input type="checkbox"/> APPL	<input type="checkbox"/> STENO

SEARCHED.....	INDEXED.....
SERIALIZED.....	FILED.....
MAY 17 1954	
FBI - NEWARK	
T. E. Kelly	

100-31936R-30

Security board rejects Oppenheimer

WASHINGTON (AP)—A special Atomic Energy Commission security board has voted to deny J. Robert Oppenheimer, famed atomic scientist, access to the nation's atomic secrets.

Herbert Marks, attorney for Oppenheimer made public the AEC action yesterday. He said he was notified of the board's decision in a letter dated May 28.

Marks said he immediately asked the AEC to reconsider the board's decision. He asked permission to file briefs.

The letter from the AEC told Oppenheimer the security board

recommended "that your clearance not be reinstated."

Gordon Gray, former secretary of the Army and now president of the University of North Carolina, headed the special board which held hearings on charges that Oppenheimer opposed development of the hydrogen bomb and had Communist links.

Marks said Gray voted with Thomas A. Morgan, former president of the Sperry Corp., in the recommendation that Oppenheimer's clearance not be reinstated.

The dissenting vote, Marks said, was cast by Ward V. Evans, chemistry professor at Loyola University at Chicago.

The board came to the "clear-

conclusion" that Oppenheimer is "a loyal citizen."

It said, however, that:

"1. We find that Dr. Oppenheimer's continuing conduct and associations have reflected a serious disregard for the requirements of the security system.

"2. We have found a susceptibility to influence which could have serious implications for the security interests of the country.

"3. We find his conduct in the hydrogen bomb program sufficiently disturbing as to raise a doubt as to whether

Continued on Page 18

NEWARK STAR LEDGER

NEWARK, N. J.

DATE 6-2-54 PAGE 1

SUBMITTED BY THE NEWARK FIELD DIVISION

<input type="checkbox"/> SAC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S #1
<input type="checkbox"/> ASAC	<input type="checkbox"/> S #2
<input type="checkbox"/> PA	<input type="checkbox"/> S #3
<input type="checkbox"/> C #1	<input type="checkbox"/> TRAIN
<input type="checkbox"/> C #2	<input type="checkbox"/> NA
<input type="checkbox"/> C #3	<input type="checkbox"/> C. CLERK
<input type="checkbox"/> ATTL	<input type="checkbox"/> S. STENO

100-31936B-31

SEARCHED.....	INDEXED.....
SERIALIZED.....	FILED.....
JUN 2 1954	
FBI - NEWARK	

Oppenheimer denied right to A-secrets

(Continued from Page One)

his future participation, if characterized by the same attitudes in a government program relating to the national defense, would be clearly consistent with the best interests of security.

"4. We have regrettably concluded that Dr. Oppenheimer has been less than candid in several instances in his testimony before this board."

Under the heading "recommendation," the board said in its report:

"In arriving at our recommendation we have sought to address ourselves to the whole question before us and not to consider the problem as a fragmented one either in terms of specific criteria or in terms of any period in Dr. Oppenheimer's life, or to consider loyalty, character and associations separately.

STRESSED LOYALTY

"However, of course, the most serious findings which this board could make as a result of these proceedings would be that of disloyalty on the part of Dr. Oppenheimer to his country. For that reason, we have given particular attention to the question of his loyalty, and we have come to a clear conclusion, which should be reassuring to the people of this country, that he is a loyal citizen. If this were the only consideration, therefore, we would recommend that the reinstatement of his clearance would not be a danger to the common defense and security.

"We have, however, been unable to arrive at the conclusion that it would be clearly consistent with the security interests of the United States to reinstate Dr. Oppenheimer's clearance and, therefore, do not so recommend."

The 50-year-old Oppenheimer, now a professor at the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton, N. J., was a pioneer in America's atomic program. He has freely acknowledged associations with Communists but has denied he, himself, had Red ties.

ORDERED 'BLANK WALL'

President Eisenhower last April 13 disclosed that he had ordered a "blank wall" set up between Oppenheimer and secret nuclear files.

That announcement followed action by the AEC last Dec. 23 refusing Oppenheimer access to the files.

Oppenheimer's lawyers released the board's findings and recommendation, a copy of a covering letter from AEC General Manager K. D. Nichols and a 16-page letter in reply to Nichols from Lloyd K. Garrison, Oppenheimer's chief attorney.

Garrison's letter said John W. Davis was joining with him in the appeal.

Davis was the unsuccessful Democratic candidate for President in 1942 and argued in the Supreme Court hearing on the recently decided segregation cases. Davis was counsel then for those opposing an end to segregation.

NEWARK STAR LEDGER

NEWARK, N. J.

DATE _____ PAGE _____

SUBMITTED BY THE NEWARK FIELD DIVISION

<input type="checkbox"/> SAC	<input type="checkbox"/> S #1
<input type="checkbox"/> ASAC	<input type="checkbox"/> S #2
<input type="checkbox"/> PA	<input type="checkbox"/> S #3
<input type="checkbox"/> C #1	<input type="checkbox"/> CHAIR
<input type="checkbox"/> C #2	<input type="checkbox"/> CLERK
<input type="checkbox"/> C #3	<input type="checkbox"/> CLERK
<input type="checkbox"/> ATTY	<input type="checkbox"/> S. STENO

SEARCHED.....	INDEXED.....
SERIALIZED.....	FILED.....
JUN 2 1954	
FBI - NEWARK	

Science as Usual

Oppenheimer Plans Normal Day's Work Despite Blow of Security Ruling

PRINCETON (AP)—Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer slept late and planned a normal day's work at the Institute for Advanced Study today, despite a great personal blow in a security board's refusal to clear him for government atomic secrets.

The Oppenheimer home is only a short distance from the home of another world-renowned physicist—Dr. Albert Einstein, who expressed trust and confidence in his friend and associate last April when the institute director was first stripped of access to A-bomb and H-bomb secrets on charges he was a security risk.

Einstein refused to comment today on the latest security board decision.

Professors Comment

Dr. Eugene P. Wigner, professor of physics at Princeton University and one of the pioneers in the development of the atom bomb, said he was "very happy"

that the Security Board had cleared Oppenheimer's name of any disloyalty.

"This confirms by own impression of Dr. Oppenheimer," Wigner said. "As for the rest of the ruling (barring him from government atom secrets), it seems to me to be entirely academic. Dr. Oppenheimer does not have a particular desire to be employed by the government. His advice and help were sought and he gave them gladly."

Another Princeton professor, Dr. Allen Shenstone of Toronto, a Canadian citizen, said he agreed with the dissenting minority opinion in the 2 to 1 Security Board ruling.

"The ruling only confirms my original feelings that there was no real sense in bringing up these charges in the first place," he said. "I feel that the majority ruling will have a bad effect on the scientific community in this country."

<input type="checkbox"/> SAC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S #1
<input type="checkbox"/> ASAC	<input type="checkbox"/> S #2
<input type="checkbox"/> PA	<input type="checkbox"/> S #3
<input type="checkbox"/> C #1	<input type="checkbox"/> TRAIN
<input type="checkbox"/> C #2	<input type="checkbox"/> NA
<input type="checkbox"/> C #3	<input type="checkbox"/> C. CLERK
<input type="checkbox"/> APPL	<input type="checkbox"/> S. STENO

NEWARK EVENING NEWS
Newark, New Jersey

Date 6-2-54 Page 13

SUBMITTED BY THE NEWARK FIELD DIVISION

SEARCHED	INDEXED
SERIALIZED	FILED
JUN 2 1954	
FBI-NEWARK	

100-31936B-32

'Loyal Citizens,' But Barred From Atomic Secrets

Oppenheimer, a Risk, Asks Quick Decision

WASHINGTON (AP) — The Atomic Energy Commission had before it today Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer's plea for quick action on a special board's split recommendation to bar him from the atomic secrets he helped unfold.

The three-man security board set up by the commission found, after six weeks of secret hearings and deliberation, that the 50-year-old "Oppy" is a "loyal citizen"—but a majority held he is too much of a security risk to get back the cleared-for-secrets status he lost last Dec. 23.

'ASSOCIATED WITH BEDS'

As disclosed yesterday by Oppenheimer's attorneys, the special board ruled 2-1 that the noted physicist and atomic pioneer had contributed to delaying a start on hydrogen bomb development and had associated with Communists for years.

In a minority opinion, Dr. Ward V. Evans, chemistry professor at Loyola University of Chicago, said of Oppenheimer:

"He did not hinder development of the H-bomb and there is absolutely nothing in the testimony to show that he did..."

COUNSEL REPLY

The Oppenheimer attorneys, headed by Lloyd K. Garrison, said in a letter to AEC General Manager K. D. Nichols that allegations by the majority were old hat—charges which the commission had thrown out seven years ago.

They asked permission to file a written brief by Monday and to argue at some later date before the commission, which must make the final decision.

<input type="checkbox"/> SAC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S #1
<input type="checkbox"/> ASAC	<input type="checkbox"/> S #2
<input type="checkbox"/> PA	<input type="checkbox"/> T #3
<input type="checkbox"/> C #1	<input type="checkbox"/> TRAIN
<input type="checkbox"/> C #2	<input type="checkbox"/> NA
<input type="checkbox"/> C #3	<input type="checkbox"/> C. CLERK
<input type="checkbox"/> APPL	<input type="checkbox"/> S. STENO

JERSEY JOURNAL
Jersey City, N.J.

Date 6-2-54 Page 10

SUBMITTED BY THE NEWARK FIELD DIVISION

100-31936B-33

SEARCHED.....	INDEXED.....
SERIALIZED.....	FILED.....
JUN 2 1954	
FBI - NEWARK	

'Attacks Ban On A-Expert'

Scientist Group Backs Oppenheimer-Few Talk at Capital

WASHINGTON AP—A security board's refusal to clear physicist J. Robert Oppenheimer for government atomic secrets drew an attack today from an atomic scientists' group but most congressmen remained silent.

The Atomic Scientists of Chicago, which is affiliated with the American Federation of Scientists, said the board's action was morally indefensible because "to our knowledge Oppenheimer's contribution to the military strength of the United States has been exceeded by no other man."

"It is ethically indefensible," the group said, "because of the shabby manner with which the whole affair has been handled."

"We cannot understand how the majority can have found Dr. Oppenheimer to be both fish and fowl," the scientists declared. "How can he be at once a loyal citizen and a security risk?"

Double Talk, Johnson Says

Chairman Cole (R., N. Y.) and most members of his joint congressional atomic energy committee declined comment on the decision. But one member—Senator Johnson (D., Col.)—called the board's action "very unsatisfactory" and "nothing more than double talk."

Senator Anderson (D., N. M.), also a member of the joint committee, said that the panel's two-day decision was "somewhat strange."

Senator Hickenlooper (R., Ia.), vice chairman of the committee, saw "nothing inconsistent" in the findings. He said a man may be perfectly loyal but still be considered a security risk because of "past associations, discretions or other surrounding circumstances." Hickenlooper declined direct comment on the board's ruling, however.

Inquiry Intimated

Cole hinted that the Congressional committee might conduct its own investigation of the Oppenheimer case. He said the group would "keep abreast" of developments pending a final decision by the AEC, to which the security board's findings have been appealed.

Then, Cole said, "the committee no doubt will want to consider it." He said the group may ultimately decide to hold hearings, if the facts appear to warrant them.

Director Samuel K. Allison of the University of Chicago's Institute of Nuclear Studies said the security panel's action will make it "exceedingly difficult" to recruit government scientists.

NEWARK EVENING NEWS
Newark, New Jersey

Date 6-2-54 Page 13

SUBMITTED BY THE NEWARK FIELD DIVISION

<input type="checkbox"/> SAC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S #1
<input type="checkbox"/> ASAC	<input type="checkbox"/> S #2
<input type="checkbox"/> PA	<input type="checkbox"/> S #3
<input type="checkbox"/> C #1	<input type="checkbox"/> TRAIN
<input type="checkbox"/> C #2	<input type="checkbox"/> NA
<input type="checkbox"/> C #3	<input type="checkbox"/> C. CLERK
<input type="checkbox"/> APPL	<input type="checkbox"/> S. STENO.

SEARCHED.....	INDEXED.....
SERIALIZED.....	FILED.....
JUN 2 1954	
FBI - NEWARK	

100-31931A-34

Oppenheimer Puts Fate Up to AEC

Skips Review Board Plea on Verdict Barring Him From A-Secrets

WASHINGTON (NS)—The nation's five-man Atomic Energy Commission began consideration today of a special personnel security board's 2 to 1 finding that Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer is a "loyal citizen," but also a security risk.

The three-member board's 15,000-word report recommended that Oppenheimer be barred permanently from secret data because of Communist associations and "disturbing con-

Other stories on Page 13.

duct" believed to have delayed the H-bomb.

In a minority opinion, Dr. Ward V. Evans, chemistry professor at Loyola University of Chicago, said of Oppenheimer:

"He did not hinder development of the H-bomb and there is absolutely nothing in the testimony to show that he did . . ."

Oppenheimer, director of the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton, N. J., and known as the "father" of the atomic bomb, placed the case in the commission's lap by refusing to appeal to the AEC's Security Review Board.

At the institute this morning, Oppenheimer's secretary, Mrs. Katherine Russell, said he "would have no further comment at this time." Mrs. Russell said the scientist felt that since he had made public the board's ruling, the next move was up to the AEC.

No Comment by Ike

At his news conference today, President Eisenhower refused to comment on the board's decision, saying the case is still going through a quasi-judicial process. Eisenhower noted that he previously had expressed great admiration for the scientist's past achievements, but until an appeal has been finally settled there would be no point in a further expression of opinion.

The Oppenheimer attorneys, headed by Lloyd K. Garrison, said in a letter to AEC General Manager K. D. Nichols that allegations by the majority were old—charges which the commission had thrown out seven years ago. They asked permission to file a written brief and to argue at some later date before the AEC, which must make the final decision.

All five members of the commission, headed by Chairman Lewis L. Strauss, were almost sure to be asked about the case during appearances today and to-

<input type="checkbox"/> SAC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S #1
<input type="checkbox"/> ASAC	<input type="checkbox"/> S #2
<input type="checkbox"/> PA	<input type="checkbox"/> S #3
<input type="checkbox"/> C #1	<input type="checkbox"/> TRAIN
<input type="checkbox"/> C #2	<input type="checkbox"/> RA
<input type="checkbox"/> C #3	<input type="checkbox"/> C. CLERK
<input type="checkbox"/> AEC	<input type="checkbox"/> S. STENO

NEWARK EVENING NEWS
Newark, New Jersey

Date 6-2-54 Page 1

SUBMITTED BY THE NEWARK FIELD DIVISION

100-31936B-35

SEARCHED.....	INDEXED.....
SERIALIZED.....	FILED.....
JUN 2 1954	
FBI - NEWARK	

ently imputed by the FBI against the scientist.

Twenty-one of the charges alleged such things as this:

That Oppenheimer lent his name to Communist fronts, contributed hundreds of dollars toward Communists' causes, admitted belonging to practically "every Communist front on the West Coast," was the husband of a one-time party member and the brother of another, associated with such West Coast Red leaders as Steve Nelson.

Did Oppose A-Bomb

The 24th charge accused him of opposing in 1949 the development of the H-bomb on moral and technical grounds and, after the project was launched, continuing to oppose it.

While conceding that he did oppose going ahead with H-bomb research while the matter was in the discussion stage, Oppenheimer has insisted that he dropped that opposition after President Truman ordered a go-ahead on the project in 1950.

As to Oppenheimer's opposition to the H-bomb program in 1949, the board said it saw in this "no lack of loyalty." It stated:

"The board was impressed by the fact that, even those who were critical of Dr. Oppenheimer's judgment and activities or lack of activities, without exception, testified to their belief in his loyalty."

U. S. Interests "Affected"

But the majority held that, whatever Oppenheimer's motivations, "the security interest of the United States were affected" by his actions. Gray and Morgan wrote, with Evans dissenting:

"We believe that, had Dr. Oppenheimer given his enthusiastic support to the program, a concerted effort would have been initiated at an earlier date."

The majority opinion said of the first 23 charges:

"There remains little doubt that, from late 1936 or early 1937 to probably April, 1942, Dr. Oppenheimer was deeply involved with many people who were active Communists. The record would suggest that the involvement was something more than an intellectual and sympathetic interest in the professed aims of the Communist party."

"Although Communist functionaries during this period considered Dr. Oppenheimer to be a Communist, there is no evidence that he was a member of the party in the strict sense of the word."

"Using Dr. Oppenheimer's own characterization of his status during that period, he seems to have been an active fellow traveler."

What Constitutes Loyalty?

In this connection, the majority opinion delved into the question

of what is meant by loyalty. It said:

"Because of widespread confusions and misapprehensions about the security system of the United States, the board feels

that it must state some considerations with respect to loyalty. If

a person is considered a security risk in terms of loyalty, the fact or possibility of active disloyalty is assumed, which would involve conduct giving some sort of aid and comfort to a foreign power."

"The Communist party is an international conspiracy organized in support of the Soviet Union."

It should then be clear that (1) a member of the Communist party is automatically barred from a position of trust with the United States Government; (2) a fellow-traveler must be declared ineligible for such a position of trust—such a person being described as one who perhaps may not be subject to party discipline, but who is sufficiently close to the party, or sympathetic with its aims, purposes and methods that danger inheres in the situation; (3) any person whose absolute loyalty to the United States is in question, aside from present or former Communist affiliations or associations, should be rejected for government service; (4) a person whose former status would be encompassed in one, two or three above, has the burden of proof of change in position and attitude which must

be so clearly borne by him as to leave no reasonable doubt in the

minds of those who are called upon to make a governmental decision in the case. If he fails in this demonstration, he must be considered a security risk and denied access to classified information."

On the matter of security, the report said:

"The board would assert the right of any citizen to be in disagreement with security measures and any other expressed policies of government. This is all a part of the right of dissent which must be preserved for our people. But the question arises whether an individual who does not accept and abide by the security system should be a part of it."

Limited by Rules

The board said another finding on Oppenheimer would have been possible except for narrow rules set up last year by the Administration

"It seemed to us," the opinion said, "that an alternative recommendation would be possible if we were allowed to exercise mature practical judgment without the rigid circumscription of regulations and criteria established for us."

That alternative, the majority said, could have been a simple recommendation that Oppenheimer not be employed as a consultant, with the result that there would be no need for a decision on whether the scientist should have access to secret matter.

Oppenheimer

(Continued From First Page)

tomorrow before the Senate-House atomic energy committee.

Held Important Posts

Until suspended last December, Oppenheimer was a member of the President's science advisory committee, a consultant to the AEC and adviser to the departments of State and Defense and the National Security Council—although the board's majority report said he devoted only 2½ days to these tasks last year.

The two members of the security board who voted for suspension were Gordon Gray and Thomas A. Morgan. Dr. Evans argued Oppenheimer had been cleared of the charges in 1947.

Gray, former Secretary of the Army and now president of the University of North Carolina, joined with Morgan, former president of the Sperry Corp., in "a clear conclusion" that Oppenheimer "is a loyal citizen."

Majority Findings

Nevertheless, they added, they could not recommend Oppenheimer's reinstatement because of these four "controlling" considerations:

1. A "serious disregard" by Oppenheimer for security requirements.

2. "Susceptibility to influence" which could hurt national security

3. "Disturbing" conduct toward the H-bomb program.

4. Lack of candor by Oppenheimer at times during the board's hearing, such as in discussing the extent of his opposition to the H-bomb program.

In his dissent, Evans said that, "all people are somewhat of a security risk," adding that Oppenheimer was no exception, but that:

"I personally think that our failure to clear Dr. Oppenheimer will be a black mark on the conscience of our country."

Among early reaction to the board's recommendation was a statement issued last night by the atomic scientists of Chicago. They called it "unfortunate . . . disturbing . . . frightening."

The 33-page report filed with the commission by Gray and Morgan sifted 24 charges, appar-

Oppenheimer says case not over

PRINCETON (AP)—Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer, smiling jauntily, showed up at his office yesterday and quietly declined to discuss a special Atomic Energy Commission board's recommendation that he be barred from atomic secrets. Wearing a dark purple

hat and carrying a portfolio under one arm, he appeared at the Institute for Advanced Study, which he heads, and posed for a newsreel camera-man.

Then he told a newsmen: "I know you are here for a comment. I have said this thing is not properly adjudicated yet. I have told the public all about

it before, and I have nothing more to say now."

Oppenheimer spent the morning at home and arrived at his office around 2 P. M., seemingly calm and undisturbed by the panel's decision.

Before he arrived, Dr. Albert Einstein came from his office in the institute to see Oppenheimer but declined to discuss the case.

NEWARK STAR LEDGER

NEWARK, N. J.

DATE 6-3-54 PAGE 5

SUBMITTED BY THE NEWARK FIELD DIVISION

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 620	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S #1
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 621	<input type="checkbox"/> S #2
<input type="checkbox"/> PA	<input type="checkbox"/> S #3
<input type="checkbox"/> C #1	<input type="checkbox"/> TRAIN
<input type="checkbox"/> C #2	<input type="checkbox"/> 64
<input type="checkbox"/> C #3	<input type="checkbox"/> 65
<input type="checkbox"/> 624	<input type="checkbox"/> 66
<input type="checkbox"/> 625	<input type="checkbox"/> 67

100-319368-36

SEARCHED.....	INDEXED.....
SERIALIZED.....	FILED.....
JUN 3 1954	
FBI - NEWARK	

Offers Haven To Scientist

Laborite Will Propose Britain Open Doors to Oppenheimer

LONDON (U)—A Labor member of Parliament announced today he would ask the Churchill government to invite Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer, American atomic scientist, "to place his knowledge at the disposal of this country."

Henry Hynd, a middle-of-the-road Laborite, said he would put his question in the House of Commons June 15 to the Minister of Works, whose department handles atomic development here.

(At Princeton, N. J., where he heads the Institute for Advanced Study, Oppenheimer today continued to refuse comment on the 2-1 recommendation of the AEC special security board that he should not be cleared to handle atomic secrets).

British Press Reaction

British newspapers of various political hues, meantime, expressed themselves editorially on the Oppenheimer case.

The Independent Times said the decision "poses an alarming question—can science and indeed other skills where they touch the safety of nations be served only by the equivalent of Soviet man, disciplined, doctrinaire, devoted narrowly to a single goal of power?"

The Liberal News Chronicle said, "America has not much to be proud of in its treatment of Dr. Oppenheimer. He seems to have become victim not so much of blind anti-Communist phobias as of a curious witchhunt against men of ideas."

The Laborite Herald headlined a Washington dispatch with: "Sack for A-bomb man alarms scientists."

The Daily Express said "Confusion and alarm" followed the Oppenheimer loyalty board deci-

NEWARK EVENING NEWS
Newark, New Jersey

Date 6-3-54 Page 4

SUBMITTED BY THE NEWARK FIELD DIVISION

5-1

100-31936-37

SEARCHED.....	INDEXED.....
SERIALIZED.....	FILED.....
JUN 3 - 1954	
FBI - NEWARK	

100-31936-37

SEARCHED.....	INDEXED.....
SERIALIZED.....	FILED.....
JUN 3 / 1954	
FBI - NEWARK	

4

on
list
oppose
doors
ner
or member
ed today he
will govern
Robert Op
atomic sci
knowledge at
country."
middle-of-the-
he would put
House of Com
the Minister of
artment handles
at here.
N. J., where he
for Advanced
today con
nt on
he

Scientists Attack Oppenheimer Rule

WASHINGTON (AP)—The Federation of American Scientists says the ruling against physicist J. Robert Oppenheimer stems from a security system "now motivated more by the risks of politics than of disclosure of information."

Describing as "unfair" a special inquiry board's 2-1 finding that Oppenheimer is a security risk, the federation said in a statement last night that the Atomic Energy Commission should conduct a review as Oppenheimer has asked.

"But beyond that," it said, "we urge strongly that the entire machinery of security must itself come under review."

The federation is a national organization of scientists formed in 1946 to act on public issues in its field.

<input type="checkbox"/> SAC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S #1
<input type="checkbox"/> ASAC	<input type="checkbox"/> S #2
<input type="checkbox"/> PA	<input type="checkbox"/> S #3
<input type="checkbox"/> C #1	<input type="checkbox"/> TRAIN
<input type="checkbox"/> C #2	<input type="checkbox"/> NA
<input type="checkbox"/> C #3	<input type="checkbox"/> C. CLERK
<input type="checkbox"/> ATTL	<input type="checkbox"/> S. SIENO

NEWARK EVENING NEWS
Newark, New Jersey

Date 6-4-54 Page 10

SUBMITTED BY THE NEWARK FIELD DIVISION

100-319368-38

SEARCHED.....	INDEXED.....
SERIALIZED.....	FILED.....
JUN 4 1954	
FBI - NEWARK	

Oppenheimer case blasted by science group

WASHINGTON (AP) — The Federation of American Scientists said yesterday the "fantastic" security case of Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer stands as black mark against the Eisenhower Administration's "entire policy of security."

The federation called not only for an Atomic Energy Commission review of the "unfair" findings of the security board but also for a review of the security program itself.

It said the Oppenheimer case illustrates "the dangers and bitter fruits of a security system which is now motivated more by the risks of politics than the risks of disclosure of information."

A special security board unanimously declared Oppenheimer a "loyal citizen" in findings made public Tuesday. But it voted 2 to 1 against re-instating his clearance for atomic secrets.

Oppenheimer, the chief "brain" behind development of the atomic bomb, will make a formal appeal against the ruling before the AEC next Monday. Meanwhile groups such as the federation, a nationwide organization of scientists and engineers in all fields, have come to his defense.

The federation said in a statement by its executive committee that the security board's majority report "bears the imprint of fair-minded men struggling unsuccessfully against the pressure of a security system extended beyond reasonable bounds."

NEWARK STAR LEDGER

NEWARK, N. J.

DATE 6-4-54 PAGE 8

SUBMITTED BY THE NEWARK FIELD DIVISION

<input type="checkbox"/> SAC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S #1
<input type="checkbox"/> ASAC	<input type="checkbox"/> S #2
<input type="checkbox"/> PA	<input type="checkbox"/> S #3
<input type="checkbox"/> C #1	<input type="checkbox"/> TRAC
<input type="checkbox"/> C #2	<input type="checkbox"/> HA
<input type="checkbox"/> C #3	<input type="checkbox"/> C. CLERK
<input type="checkbox"/> ATTORNEY	<input type="checkbox"/> S. STENO.

100-319368-39

SEARCHED.....	INDEXED.....
SERIALIZED.....	FILED.....
JUN 4 1954	
FBI - NEWARK	

Paterson Evening Times

Founded October 13, 1883

Sunday Times Advertiser

Founder 1883

James Kerney, Editor and Publisher

1873-1934

I do the very best I know how, the very best I can and I mean to keep doing so till the end; if the end brings me out all right, what is said against me won't amount to anything.—Abraham Lincoln

Thursday, June 3, 1954

Less Than Justice

The decision of a special Personnel Security Board of the Atomic Energy Commission in the case of Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer defies rationalization.

The board, consisting of three members, voted unanimously that Dr. Oppenheimer, head of the Los Alamos atomic bomb project during the war, was a "loyal" citizen and "discreet" in handling atomic secrets.

By a divided vote, however, the board opposed his reinstatement as a consultant to the government on atomic energy matters. Dr. Ward F. Evans, chemistry professor of Loyola University, Chicago, came up with a refreshingly straightforward and courageous dissenting opinion in which he refused to "damn" Dr. Oppenheimer and "ruin his career and his service."

The injustice of the majority recommendation is emphasized pointedly in Dr. Evans' opinion. This proposed restriction against Dr. Oppenheimer is based upon his early associations and interests. Yet, all of this derogatory information was in the hands of the Atomic Energy Commission when Dr. Oppenheimer was cleared in 1947. The Commission took a chance on his special talents and he did his work with great distinction.

Now that the job is done, Dr. Evans observes, "we are asked to investigate him for practically the same derogatory information." There was not the slightest vestige of evidence before the board that would indicate that Dr. Oppenheimer is not a loyal citizen of his country. Yet, the majority of the board does not hesitate to mark him with suspicion.

If the judgment of this board is permitted to stand, the Eisenhower Administration, which initiated the investigation and suspension of Dr. Oppenheimer, must bear the onus of injustice and ingratitude to a scientist of rare brilliance who was a principal builder of American atomic supremacy.

5-1

100-31936B-40

100-31936B

SEARCHED.....	INDEXED.....
SERIALIZED.....	FILED.....
JUN 4 - 1954	
FBI - NEWARK	

DIVISION

Atomic Scientists Hit Treatment Of Oppenheimer

LOS ALAMOS, N.M. (AP)
—A petition from more than 280 Los Alamos atomic scientists strongly criticizes government handling of the case of D. J. Robert Oppenheimer.

And, the scientists warned, the action taken against Oppenheimer may make it tough in the future to fill government laboratories with trained workers.

<input type="checkbox"/> SAC _____	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S #1 _____
<input type="checkbox"/> ASAC _____	<input type="checkbox"/> S #2 _____
<input type="checkbox"/> PA _____	<input type="checkbox"/> S #3 _____
<input type="checkbox"/> C #1 _____	<input type="checkbox"/> TRAIN _____
<input type="checkbox"/> C #2 _____	<input type="checkbox"/> NA _____
<input type="checkbox"/> C #3 _____	<input type="checkbox"/> C. CLERK _____
<input type="checkbox"/> APPL _____	<input type="checkbox"/> S. STENO _____

JERSEY JOURNAL
Jersey City, N.J.

Date 6-9-54 Page 1

SUBMITTED BY THE NEWARK FIELD DIVISION

SEARCHED.....	INDEXED.....
SERIALIZED.....	FILED.....
JUN 9 1954	
FBI - NEWARK	

100-319368-41

Backs Curb On Scientist

AEC Manager Reported Supporting Ban of Oppenheimer

NEW YORK (AP)—The New York Times said today that Maj. Gen. Kenneth D. Nichols, general manager of the Atomic Energy Commission, has drafted his recommendation in the Oppenheimer security case.

"It supports the Gray board's finding that Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer is 'loyal' but should not be retained as a consultant to the commission," a Washington dispatch to The Times said.

"Thus, the famous atomic scientist has lost another round—the next to the last—in his long

fight to be restored as a reliable servant of his government."

Not in Final Form

The story also said:

Nichols's recommendation has not been delivered in final form to the members of the AEC, but this will be done later this week when the five-man commission will begin the final step in the proceedings. Nichols has discussed his recommendation with commission members.

It is understood that Nichols's letter to the AEC is more critical of Oppenheimer than the majority findings of the Gray board—a three-member special Atomic Energy Commission security board.

The board—headed by Gordon Gray, former Secretary of the Army and now president of the University of North Carolina—recently found unanimously that Oppenheimer is a loyal citizen and it praised his discretion. The board voted 2 to 1, however, that under the Administration's regulations Oppenheimer must be classified as a security risk.

NEWARK EVENING NEWS
Newark, New Jersey

Date 6-14-54 Page 6

SUBMITTED BY THE NEWARK FIELD DIVISION

<input type="checkbox"/> SAC	<input type="checkbox"/> S #1
<input type="checkbox"/> ASAC	<input type="checkbox"/> S #2
<input type="checkbox"/> PA	<input type="checkbox"/> S #3
<input type="checkbox"/> C #1	<input type="checkbox"/> TRAIN
<input type="checkbox"/> C #2	<input type="checkbox"/> NA
<input type="checkbox"/> C #3	<input type="checkbox"/> C. CLERK
<input type="checkbox"/> APFL	<input type="checkbox"/> S. STENO

SEARCHED.....	INDEXED.....
SERIALIZED.....	FILED.....
JUN 14 1954	
FBI - NEWARK	

100-31936B-42

H-bomb delay of 4 yrs. laid to Oppenheimer

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The "father of the H-bomb," Dr. Edward Teller, testified he believes the United States could have developed the hydrogen bomb at least four years earlier if Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer and others had given the project their "moral" support, it was disclosed last night.

The statement came from Teller, the Hungarian-born nuclear physicist, who is credited with sparking postwar development of the H-bomb, during the secret investigation of Oppenheimer's loyalty and security.

But former AEC chairman Gordon Dean disputed Teller's testimony and gave Oppenheimer his full backing. Dean said that as far as he knew Oppenheimer did not hinder development of the H-bomb.

The Atomic Energy Commission Personnel Security Board ruled recently that Oppenheimer, though loyal and discreet, is a security risk. Oppenheimer is the scientist credited with masterminding wartime development of the A-bomb.

HITS ATTITUDE

Teller said he considers Oppenheimer a loyal American who would not willingly breach security regulations. But judging by Oppenheimer's attitude toward the H-bomb and other atomic issues after the war, Teller said, he believes "one would be wiser not to grant (him security) clearance."

Teller's testimony and that of numerous other scientists became public shortly after Oppenheimer's attorneys disclosed they told the AEC that his lack of enthusiasm for the H-bomb program was not a valid reason for labelling the famed atomic scientist a security risk.

They advanced the argument in an appeal filed with the AEC last week and made public tonight.

The special AEC panel voted 2 to 1 against reinstating Oppenheimer's security clearance.

Oppenheimer has appealed.

NEWARK STAMP LEDGER

FOR MR. E. J.

DATE 6-16-54 PAGE 1

SUBMITTED BY THE NEWARK FIELD DIVISION

<input type="checkbox"/> SAC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S #1
<input type="checkbox"/> ASAC	<input type="checkbox"/> S #2
<input type="checkbox"/> PA	<input type="checkbox"/> S #3
<input type="checkbox"/> C #1	<input type="checkbox"/> TRAIN
<input type="checkbox"/> C #2	<input type="checkbox"/> NA
<input type="checkbox"/> C #3	<input type="checkbox"/> C. CLERK
<input type="checkbox"/> APTL	<input type="checkbox"/> S. STENO

100-319368-43

SEARCHED.....	INDEXED.....
SERIALIZED.....	FILED.....
JUN 16 1954	
FBI - NEWARK	

the decision of the security board, headed by former Army Secretary Gordon Gray, directly to the Atomic Energy Commission. The board's ruling that the famed "Mr. Atom" of World War II is loyal but unsafe from a security standpoint has generally been condemned by organization of scientists.

So the AEC released the full transcript—except for parts involving state secrets—to the press. The commission distributed the 991-page document to newsmen shortly after 6 P. M. EDT for release at noon today. But radio commentator Fulton Lewis Jr. broke the release and others followed suit with AEC acquiescence.

Many other scientific witnesses strongly supported Oppenheimer. One of them was Dr. Norris E. Bradbury, Oppenheimer's successor and present director of the Los Alamos Laboratory.

Bradbury said he always found both Oppenheimer and the general advisory committee "extremely helpful and cooperative" in H-bomb matters. He said he "never knew them (GAC members) or Dr. Oppenheimer to take a stand or a position or to give advice which was other than useful and helpful..."

Former AEC chairman Gordon Dean testified that Oppenheimer "expressed enthusiasm" for and went to "great pains to help" the H-bomb program after developments in the summer of 1951 gave the thermonuclear program great promise.

Dean also declared that he knew of "no instance" when Oppenheimer ever discouraged other scientists from contributing to the program after President Truman ordered the H-bomb into production in January, 1950.

RAPS TELLER

The one-time AEC chairman conceded, however, that some H-bomb enthusiasts—notably Teller—"intimated" that Oppenheimer would not be cooperative. He suggested that Teller's trouble in recruiting scientists stemmed more from his own limitations than any opposition from Oppenheimer.

Dean insisted that he studied all the derogatory information against the famed Princeton physicist and was convinced he is completely loyal to his country and in no sense a security risk.

DA
SUBMIT

DIVISION

A-Scientist Is Defended

Oppenheimer's Counsel Challenge Security Board Findings

WASHINGTON (AP)—The findings of the special personnel security board of the Atomic Energy Commission were challenged today by attorneys for Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer.

The lawyer's assailed the board's charges that the atomic scientist had shown disregard for security requirements, he had been susceptible to influence and he had been "less than candid" in testifying before the board.

Oppenheimer's counsel also argued that his lack of enthusiastic support for the H-bomb project did not make him a security risk.

His lawyers are Lloyd K. Garrison and John W. Davis. They asked the full commission to reverse the security board's findings and give Oppenheimer a clean bill.

Service Acknowledged

"Lack of enthusiasm for a program in which a scientist does not believe, or lack of unqualified commitment to a single strategic theory, is not an admissible consideration in determining whether a man is a security risk," the lawyers contended.

The Oppenheimer lawyers released to the press last night copies of the brief they had filed with the commission June 7. The brief made these points:

The security board found Oppenheimer loyal as well as discreet and also acknowledged his great public service.

In opposing the hydrogen bomb project during the Autumn of 1949 the scientist was expressing an "honest view based on his judgment of the interests of the country and the good of humanity" without "the slightest motivation of disloyalty."

Found "Extremely Honest"

The impression that he was less than candid with the security board was not shared by one member, who found the witness "extremely honest." Analysis of the specific instances in which he was charged with lack of candor did not bear out the impression of the majority.

The board's finding that he was susceptible to influence

was based on a misconception of the meaning of President Eisenhower's executive order establishing such susceptibility as a security-risk criterion, and of the specific instances cited by the board.

Most of Oppenheimer's left-wing associations dated from before World War II and were known to the AEC when it cleared him in 1947. His questioned postwar associations were "so few and so patently harmless" that they in no way reflected on his trustworthiness as a security risk.

Oppenheimer was depicted as a pioneer who foresaw an arsenal of small and large atomic weapons and advised Gen. Eisenhower on their use in December, 1951, in Europe.

NEWARK EVENING NEWS
Newark, New Jersey

Date 6-16-54 Page 11

SUBMITTED BY THE NEWARK FIELD DIVISION

<input type="checkbox"/> SAC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2 #1
<input type="checkbox"/> ASAC	<input type="checkbox"/> S #2
<input type="checkbox"/> PA	<input type="checkbox"/> S #3
<input type="checkbox"/> C #1	<input type="checkbox"/> TRAIN
<input type="checkbox"/> C #2	<input type="checkbox"/> NA
<input type="checkbox"/> C #3	<input type="checkbox"/> C. CLERK
<input type="checkbox"/> ATTL	<input type="checkbox"/> S. STENO

100-319368-44

SEARCHED.....	INDEXED.....
SERIALIZED.....	FILED.....
JUN 16 1954	
FBI - NEWARK	

H-Bomb 'Inventor' Regards Oppenheimer as a Risk

WASHINGTON (AP)—The man credited by many atomic scientists with unlocking the door to the hydrogen bomb says he would feel safer if Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer did not have custody of the nation's vital secrets.

The scientist is Dr. Edward Teller, 46-year-old University of California professor, who said he regards Oppenheimer as a loyal American but questions his wisdom and judgment.

Oppenheimer himself calls Teller the "principal inventor" of the H-bomb.

But even as Teller expressed reservations about Oppenheimer, father of the atomic bomb during World War II, many of the key men who worked with Oppenheimer in top secret projects rallied to Oppenheimer's defense, saying he was a man of complete loyalty, integrity and devotion to his country.

Testimony Conflicting

On the other side of the picture, William L. Borden, former executive secretary of the Senate-House atomic committee, described Oppenheimer as "more probably than not an agent of the Soviet Union."

All this conflicting testimony—and a backstage account of the development of the H-bomb—was disclosed in the release of the transcript of hearings before a special security board of the Atomic Energy Commission.

The board ruled May 27 that Oppenheimer was a loyal American and a discreet one.

But, in a 2-1 split, it said the physicist was a security risk—not entitled any more to access to the atomic information he helped store up for 10 years.

NEWARK EVENING NEWS
Newark, New Jersey

Date 6-16-54 Page 11

SUBMITTED BY THE NEWARK FIELD DIVISION

<input type="checkbox"/> SAC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S #
<input type="checkbox"/> ASAC	<input type="checkbox"/> S #2
<input type="checkbox"/> PA	<input type="checkbox"/> S #3
<input type="checkbox"/> C #1	<input type="checkbox"/> TRAIN
<input type="checkbox"/> C #2	<input type="checkbox"/> NA
<input type="checkbox"/> C #3	<input type="checkbox"/> C. CLERK
<input type="checkbox"/> ATTL	<input type="checkbox"/> S. STENO

100-319368-45

SEARCHED.....	INDEXED.....
SERIALIZED.....	FILED.....
JUN 16 1954	
FBI - NEWARK	

Admits Mistakes

Oppenheimer and his attorneys have appealed to the full AEC to overturn this finding. The commission promised a decision this month.

The 500,000 words of testimony from 40 witnesses ran through the gamut of charges that Oppenheimer had been a contributor and fellow traveler with Communist causes until 1942, that he lied to Army intelligence officers investigating Russian atomic espionage in 1942, and that he opposed an all-out effort to develop the H-bomb as late as 1949.

All this was conceded by Oppenheimer, who said he had made mistakes in the past and had once been an "idiot," but carefully guarded the host of secrets "I have had . . . in my head a long time."

A virtual roll call of former AEC commissioners and top atomic scientists backed up former AEC chairman Gordon Dean, who described Oppenheimer as one of the few men who can completely demonstrate his loyalty to his country "by his performance . . . a man of complete integrity . . . a very devoted man to his country."

Aside from Oppenheimer and his wife, there were 30 witnesses. Attorneys for Oppenheimer said 25 of them voiced no doubts at all about him.

Bush's Faith Unshaken

Here are highlights from testimony of some of the witnesses:

Dr. Vannevar Bush, wartime director of the Office of Scientific Research and Development—"Great confidence in his (Oppenheimer's) judgment and integrity . . . his 'faith' in Oppenheimer 'has not in the slightest degree been shaken.'"

Dr. Karl T. Compton, former president of Massachusetts Institute of Technology and a Presidential adviser—Revocation of Oppenheimer's security clearance would be felt by the scientific community as "a shock, there would be discouragement, there would be confusion . . . I think the result would be very bad . . . for the country."

Devoted Citizen

Dr. James B. Fisk, research vice president of Bell Laboratories and a member of the AEC advisory committee—"I know of no more devoted citizen in this country."

George F. Keenan, veteran diplomat and onetime Ambassador to Russia—Oppenheimer or anybody else could have opposed development of the H-bomb "out of devotion to the interests of our country."

Dr. James B. Conant, U. S. high commissioner in Germany, former AEC adviser: "A more loyal and sound American citizen cannot be found in the whole United States."

Dr. Norris Bradbury, scientific director of the Los Alamos atomic laboratory, center of atomic and hydrogen research—Oppenheimer is "completely loyal" and "I do not regard him as a security risk." He knows of no case where Oppenheimer persuaded any one not to work on the H-bomb project and doesn't think "that the program was slowed down."

"Good Security Risk"

Dr. Hans Bethe of Cornell, a pioneer in theories forming the basis for the H-bombs—"I do not think there has been any delay" in perfection of the H-bomb. Oppenheimer discussed the H-bomb with him and was "troubled" but did not take a stand as to whether it should be built.

Dr. Robert Bacher, former AEC member, now of the California Institute of Technology—"I have the highest confidence in Dr. Oppenheimer . . . a person of high character . . . a man of discretion, a good security risk and a person of full loyalty to the country . . . this (H-bomb work) went ahead pretty fast. . . ."

Dr. Mervin J. Kelly, president of Bell Laboratories—Oppenheimer's absence from atomic councils "would be a distinct loss."

The most revealing new testimony was the inside version from Dean and other scientists and officials of the pulling and hauling in secret over whether to launch a big H-bomb effort after the Russians "exploited an atomic

bomb in the Fall of 1949, and what happened to that effort. They called the H-bomb "the super" and "the gadget."

H-Program Stalled

The picture unfolded was that even after former President Truman ordered the H-bomb project in January, 1950, for more than a year the program was stalled and prospects were dismal.

"We never saw anything that really had a chance" of producing a workable bomb, Dean testified, until he called all top scientists together at a meeting at Princeton in June, 1951. Oppenheimer and several other scientists agreed that original premises about how to build an H-bomb had collapsed and the scientists were worried that the Presidential directive could not be carried out.

Changed His Stand

Dr. J. W. Alvarez, University of California scientist, said Oppenheimer told a Pentagon meeting almost a year after the Truman directive that the H-bomb project "will die a natural death" after Pacific tests planned for 1951 "fail." He quoted Oppenheimer as saying that would be "the natural time to chop the hydrogen bomb program off."

Then, in the Spring of 1951, Dr. Teller made what was described as a "brilliant discovery" and brought this idea to the June meeting at Princeton.

After two days, Dean said, everybody was convinced the project at last was on the right track and Oppenheimer himself was "enthusiastic . . . almost thrilled."

Oppenheimer testified that "from then on it became clear that this was a program which was bound to succeed." He said production of an actual hydrogen explosion in late 1952, after the discoveries in the first half of 1951, was "a miracle of speed."

Believes Scientist Loyal

Teller said he assumes—and will continue to assume until shown convincing proof otherwise—that Oppenheimer is loyal to the United States. But he added: "I would feel personally more secure if public matters would rest in other hands."

NEWARK EVENING NEWS Asked whether he believes Oppenheimer to be a security risk, Teller replied:

Date _____ Pa _____

"I thoroughly disagreed with him in numerous issues and his actions frankly appeared to me confused and complicated. To

this extent I feel that I would like to see the vital interests of this country in hands which I understand better, and therefore trust more."

What about security, Teller was asked. Would granting clearance to Oppenheimer endanger national security?

Teller Confused

If it were a question of Oppenheimer's intent, Teller replied, there would be no harm done in granting him clearance. But if it were a question of wisdom and judgment it might be better to hold up the clearance, Teller said.

Teller said that if Oppenheimer and other nuclear scientists like him had lent him some moral support in 1945—instead of pulling out of Los Alamos, N. M.—he could have developed his "thermonuclear gadget" four years earlier.

Borden, who made the strongest attack on Oppenheimer, read a letter he said he wrote to FBI Chief J. Edgar Hoover last November 7. The letter related a series of incidents which Borden said justified his belief that Oppenheimer willingly spied for the Soviets.

Says Friends Were Red

Borden said Oppenheimer "had no close friends except Communists . . . had at least one Communist mistress . . . was in frequent contact with Soviet espionage agents . . ." He said on the day the first publicly disclosed A-bomb was dropped on Hiroshima, Oppenheimer personally urged senior workers in the H-bomb field "to resist."

Attorneys for Oppenheimer protested admitting Borden's letter to the record, saying "this kind of an accusation (was) no dreamed of in this proceeding up to this point."

His Loyalty Disputed

Key H-Bomb Scientists Divided on Oppenheimer

WASHINGTON (AP)—The man credited by many atomic scientists with unlocking the door to the hydrogen bomb says he would feel safer if Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer did not have custody of the nation's vital secrets.

The scientist is Dr. Edward Teller, 46-year-old University of California professor, said by Oppenheimer himself to have been the "principal inventor" of the fearful H-bomb.

RALLY TO DEFENSE

But even as Dr. Teller expressed some reservations about Oppenheimer, father of the atomic bomb during World War II, many of the key men who worked shoulder to shoulder with him in top secret projects rallied to Oppenheimer's defense, saying he was a man of complete loyalty, integrity and devotion to his country.

On the other side of the picture, William L. Borden, former executive secretary of the Senate-House Atomic Committee, described Oppenheimer as

"more probably than not an agent of the Soviet Union."

Teller said he regarded Oppenheimer as loyal, but said "I would like to see the vital interests of this country in hands which I understand better, and therefore trust more."

TRANSCRIPT RELEASED

All this conflicting testimony—and a backstage account of the momentous, tortuous development of the H-bomb—was disclosed in the release of the transcript of hearings before a special security board of the Atomic Energy Commission.

The board ruled May 27 that Oppenheimer was a loyal American and a discreet one. But, in a two-to-one split, it said the famed, thin physicist with the crew haircut was a security risk—not entitled any more to access to the atomic information he helped store up for 10 years.

Oppenheimer and his attorneys have appealed to the full AEC to overturn this finding. The commission promised a decision this month.

JERSEY JOURNAL
Jersey City, N.J.

Date 6-16-54 Page 1

SUBMITTED BY THE NEWARK FIELD DIVISION

<input type="checkbox"/> SAC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S #1
<input type="checkbox"/> ASAC	<input type="checkbox"/> S #2
<input type="checkbox"/> PA	<input type="checkbox"/> S #3
<input type="checkbox"/> C #1	<input type="checkbox"/> TR
<input type="checkbox"/> C #2	<input type="checkbox"/> NA
<input type="checkbox"/> C #3	<input type="checkbox"/> C. C.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ATFL	<input type="checkbox"/> S. S.

100-393664

SEARCHED.....	INDEXED.....
SERIALIZED.....	FILED.....
JUN 1 6 1954	
FBI - NEWARK	

Secret papers in Oppenheimer case 'stolen'

WASHINGTON (AP) - Rep. Henry H. Hinshaw (R-Calif.) said yesterday a semi-secret summary of the proceedings in the security case of Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer, and some secret FBI documents, were lost or stolen last Friday night. They were recovered again Sunday, in a lost-and-found railway office, but Hinshaw said the summary's temporary disappearance was one reason the Atomic Energy Commission voted to release a transcript. The theory was that the loss

and then recovered

Compromised the security of the summary and that it may have, in a sense, become public property. Hinshaw said the Senate House Atomic Energy Commission, of which he is a member, received a letter from the AEC

telling this story:

AEC Commissioner Eugene M. Zuckert had the papers with him but missed them when he left a train Friday night at Stamford, Conn.

The commission met Saturday to consider the matter, three

of the five members being present. They voted 2-1 against releasing the transcript.

On Wednesday, a second meeting was held with all five present. The vote was 4-1 this time in favor of releasing the transcript.

NEW YORK STAR LEDGER

NEWARK, N. J.

DATE 6-11-54 PAGE 1

SUBMITTED BY THE NEWARK FIELD DIVISION

☐ SAC ☒ S #1
☐ ASAC ☐ S #2
☐ PA ☐ S #3
☐ C #1 ☐ TRAIN
☐ C #2 ☐ NA
☐ C #3 ☐ C. CLERK
☐ ADPL ☐ S. STENO

100-31936B-47

SEARCHED	INDEXED
SERIALIZED	FILED
JUN 17 1954	
FBI - NEWARK	

Oppenheimer asks reversal of A-decision

WASHINGTON (UP) — Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer asked the Atomic Energy Commission yesterday to reverse a special board's decision barring him from government atomic secrets.

The famed atom-scientist filed a written brief after being denied the right to oral arguments in the fight against security charges against him.

Oppenheimer's attorney, Lloyd K. Garrison and Herbert S. Marks worked late into Monday night drafting the lengthy arguments against the board's decision. They had planned to submit the brief Monday but had to put it off until yesterday.

Immediate disclosure of the brief is prevented by AEC regulations. However, the attorneys are expected to challenge the board's findings in light of its assertion that Oppenheimer is a "loyal" and "discreet" citizen.

A 2-1 majority of the board, headed by former Army Secretary Gordon H. Gray, voted against clearing Oppenheimer because of his "serious disregard" for security regulations and his "disturbing conduct" on the hydrogen bomb program.

NEWARK STAR LEDGER

NEWARK, N. J.

DATE 6-9-54 PAGE 2

SUBMITTED BY THE NEWARK FIELD DIVISION

<input type="checkbox"/> SAC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S #1
<input type="checkbox"/> ASAC	<input type="checkbox"/> S #2
<input type="checkbox"/> PA	<input type="checkbox"/> S #3
<input type="checkbox"/> C #1	<input type="checkbox"/> TRAIN
<input type="checkbox"/> C #2	<input type="checkbox"/> NA
<input type="checkbox"/> C #3	<input type="checkbox"/> C. CLERK
<input type="checkbox"/> APPL	<input type="checkbox"/> S. STENO

100-319368-48

SEARCHED.....	INDEXED.....
SERIALIZED.....	FILED.....
JUN 9 1954	
FBI - NEWARK	

NATIONAL SUICIDE

No less than ten noted scientists have told President Eisenhower that the security system under which Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer was barred from Government secrets poses such a grave threat to scientific research it could lead to national suicide. These scientists have asked the President, in an open letter, to review the security system.

No one can blame these scientists for thinking the way they do. Oppenheimer was a pioneer in atomic research and head of the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton, N. J., but a special board of inquiry held him to be a security risk, although they termed him a "loyal citizen."

If a man has once been proven to be linked up with the Communist movement there is a certain amount of risk bound to be present if he is placed in a high position of trust. He may be perfectly loyal today, but what will he be tomorrow? The Reds may be able to exert sufficient pressure on him that, no matter how reluctant he may be to change his mind he will not be able to resist them. A man handling such top-notch secrets as those that deal with A and H bombs has too much of this country's safety at stake to be any such risk.

It does seem harsh for a committee to classify such a learned man as "a loyal citizen" and yet keep him from the highly scientific work that he can do so well. However, it may be more of a protection to this man of science than he realizes. If he doesn't know what is going on in this realm of atomic research it will make it impossible for the Reds to reach him in any way to make him tell what he knows.

There is no profit in looking back on the mistakes we have made in the past, but it is regrettable that so many of our people in high places became so friendly with the Communists during World War II and the period immediately following. All of us were fooled, from President Roosevelt down, for then we never dreamed the Soviet would become as great, if not a greater, menace than Hitler and his legions. It is extremely unfortunate that now we must look with a certain amount of question on anyone who became connected with the Communists at that time. However, for the safety of our nation we must do so and "the chips must fall where they may."

Woodbury Daily Times
June 7, 1954

100-31936B-47

SEARCHED	INDEXED
SERIALIZED	FILED
JUN 7 1954	
FBI - NEWARK	

Longman

A-Scientist Make Appeal

Call on Eisenhower to Review Entire Security System

WASHINGTON (MS)—Ten scientists called on President Eisenhower today to review the case of Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer on grounds that a "purge of a loyal scientist . . . is a sure road to national suicide."

The 10, including all of the officers of the Federation of American Scientists, urged the President in an "open letter" to study the security system under which Oppenheimer was suspended as a security risk by the Atomic Energy Commission.

The group charged that he was "purged" for "giving frank advice" and added: "Such a policy, if continued, will eliminate the men of independent mind from our defense establishments." They strongly condemned the

2-1 finding of a special AEC board that labeled Oppenheimer "loyal" and "discreet" but said he was not entitled to have access to atomic secrets as a consultant.

Appeal Filed

Oppenheimer's attorneys, headed by Lloyd K. Garrison, have asked the AEC to bypass the usual review by the commission's Personnel Security Review Board and have the commission itself take the case "under immediate consideration." They requested permission to file a written brief by today and to argue at a later date.

A high AEC official, who asked not to be named, said last night Oppenheimer's lawyers have been told they could file a written brief but not present the arguments. To allow the oral presentation before the commissioners, he said, would set a precedent for all other security risk cases. Presenting their arguments for a change in the nation's security system, the scientists declared:

"There is a great need to clarify what is meant by a 'security risk' . . . We believe a man should be considered a security risk only if there is substantial evidence to indicate that he might, either wilfully or inadver-

tently, transmit classified information to unauthorized personnel. "The end of a man's associations is not a factor in this determination only as circumstantial evidence, and suspect associations by themselves should not constitute a security risk if a man's reliability is clearly demonstrable on other grounds."

Program Damaged

The signers charged: "The present personal security program has severely damaged the vitality of . . . scientific research and . . . development," and suggested:

"It is clearly the responsibility of the President to take action in this perilous situation . . . appoint a special board of responsible government, scientific and legal leaders to devise a security policy which would provide the optimum balance between the negative security of secrecy and the positive security of achievement."

The scientists declared that the decision of the special three-man security board who judged Oppenheimer's case, "revealed many of the confusions on basic principles so evident in present government security policies."

Hearings Praised

They praised many of the features of the AEC hearing procedures—such as the "prior listing of charges, representation by counsel, the right to cross-examination," and suggested that these and other provisions "could be copied to advantage by other Federal agencies."

The signers of the letter were: Federation chairman M. Stanley Livingston, Nobel Prize winner James Franck, science service director William Davis, University of North Carolina chemistry professor Oscar K. Rice, Yale University physicist Ernest C. Pollar, W. A. Higinbotham of the Brookhaven National Laboratory, L. I.; Princeton University physics professor Arthur S. Wightman, atomic researcher Lewis Tonks, Maryland University scientist John S. Toll and David L. Hill, theoretical physicist at the Los Alamos, N. M., scientific laboratory.

NEWARK EVENING NEWS
Newark, New Jersey

Date 6-7-54 Page 8

SUBMITTED BY THE NEWARK FIELD DIVISION

<input type="checkbox"/> SAC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S #1
<input type="checkbox"/> ASAC	<input type="checkbox"/> S #2
<input type="checkbox"/> PA	<input type="checkbox"/> S #3
<input type="checkbox"/> C #1	<input type="checkbox"/> TRAIN
<input type="checkbox"/> C #2	<input type="checkbox"/> NA
<input type="checkbox"/> C #3	<input type="checkbox"/> C. CLERK
<input type="checkbox"/> APPL	<input type="checkbox"/> S. STENO

SEARCHED..... INDEXED.....
SERIALIZED..... FILED.....
JUN 7 1954
FBI NEWARK

100-819348-50

Deny Oppenheimer oral appeal to AEC

WASHINGTON (U.P.)—The Atomic Energy Commission last night denied Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer the right to oral arguments in his appeal against a special security

board decision denying him access to atomic secrets.

AEC General Manager Kenneth D. Nichols said the commission does "not contemplate any further presentation by Dr. Oppenheimer, either oral or written" when it reviews the board's ruling.

But he said, in a letter to Oppenheimer's attorney, Lloyd K. Garrison, that a brief which Garrison plans to file today will be given "very careful consideration" by the five-member commission. The AEC has agreed to review the case.

The security board unanimously found the prominent atomic physicist a "loyal citizen." But it voted 2-1 against reinstating his clearance for atomic secrets, partly because of past associations and partly because he was not "enthusiastic" about development of the hydrogen bomb.

The decision provoked a storm of controversy, with many scientific organizations coming to Oppenheimer's defense. As scientific chief of the war-time atomic project at Los Alamos, N. M., Oppenheimer was instrumental in this country's development of the A-bomb.

Nichols told Garrison that further presentation by Oppenheimer was not expected because he had waived his right to a review by the AEC's personnel security review board.

Garrison had asked that the case be reviewed immediately by the full commission to prevent a "further delay" in final disposition. He told reporters in New York he will file the brief today.

NEWARK STAR LEDGER

NEWARK, N. J.

DATE 6-8-54 PAGE 2

SUBMITTED BY THE NEWARK FIELD DIVISION

<input type="checkbox"/> SAC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S #1
<input type="checkbox"/> ASAC	<input type="checkbox"/> S #2
<input type="checkbox"/> PA	<input type="checkbox"/> S #3
<input type="checkbox"/> C #1	<input type="checkbox"/> TRAIN
<input type="checkbox"/> C #2	<input type="checkbox"/> NA
<input type="checkbox"/> C #3	<input type="checkbox"/> C. CLEAR.
<input type="checkbox"/> APPL.	<input type="checkbox"/> S. STENO.

SEARCHED	INDEXED
SERIALIZED	FILED
JUN 8 1954	
FBI - NEWARK	

100-379368-57

Denies Oppenheimer Delayed U. S. H-Bomb

WASHINGTON (AP)—One of the world's leading authorities on hydrogen explosives was cited today in opposition to Dr. Edward Teller's statement that the H-bomb could have been made four years sooner if Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer had supported it.

Testimony given by Dr. Hans Bethe at Oppenheimer's security hearings showed that the Cornell University professor who solved the sun's energy process believes that there was no "overall" loss of time in U. S. perfection of hydrogen weapons.

Meanwhile, it was learned that the decision of the Atomic Energy Commission to release the Oppenheimer testimony was prompted by the fact that one of the commissioners, Eugene Zuckert, lost portions of the transcript on a train.

Found in Two Days

Members of the Congressional atomic committee were informed that the missing papers were found 48 hours later at a railroad lost-and-found booth and were assured there was no evidence of attempted theft.

However, the commissioners voted 4 to 1 to release the testimony because it has been "exposed" to possible unauthorized view.

Congressional Democrats today rejected this as "just an excuse by the AEC."

"The summary was temporarily misplaced and later returned," said Representative Hollifield (D., Cal.), a member of the House-Senate atomic energy committee. "As far as I know there is no evidence that anybody had made any use of it. I think the incident is being used as an excuse for releasing the testimony."

May Reveal Decision

Members of the AEC, considering whether Oppenheimer should be declared a security risk, were scheduled to appear before the Congressional atomic committee today to discuss power.

The AEC members may reveal whether they have yet reached a decision in Oppenheimer's case. A special board recommended, 2 to 1, that he be dropped as an atomic advisor but the final decision rests with the five-man commission.

Publication of the Oppenheimer security testimony Tuesday showed that Teller, builder of the H-bomb, is Oppenheimer's principal scientific accuser and believes that Oppenheimer's opposition helped delay the H-bomb four years.

Bethe, who was Teller's division chief when both worked under Oppenheimer in the Los Alamos, N. M., atomic bomb laboratory during World War II, believed there was no delay.

- | | |
|-------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> SAC | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S #1 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> ASAC | <input type="checkbox"/> S #2 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> PA | <input type="checkbox"/> S #3 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> C #1 | <input type="checkbox"/> TRAIN |
| <input type="checkbox"/> C #2 | <input type="checkbox"/> NA |
| <input type="checkbox"/> C #3 | <input type="checkbox"/> C. CLERK |
| <input type="checkbox"/> APPL | <input type="checkbox"/> S. STENO |

NEWARK EVENING NEWS
Newark, New Jersey

Date 6-17-54 Page 11

SUBMITTED BY THE NEWARK FIELD DIVISION

100-379368-52

SEARCHED	INDEXED
SERIALIZED	FILED
JUN 17 1954	
FBI - NEWARK	

Oppenheimer Reaches End Of the Road

WASHINGTON (INS) — Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer, "father" of the A-Bomb, reached the end of the road today as a trusted advisor to the government in the face of an Atomic Energy Commission decision that he is a security risk.

By a 4 to 1 decision, the commission ruled that Oppenheimer should not be permitted access to U.S. atomic and hydrogen bomb secrets and one member of the commission flatly asserted the famed 50-year-old physicist is "disloyal."

WONT CHALLENGE

Members of the joint Congressional Atomic Energy Committee indicated clearly they will not challenge the commission's finding which upheld a previous 2 to 1 recommendation of a special security board.

The only possibility that the commission's decision, issued late yesterday, might be overturned would be for President Eisenhower to rule otherwise and there seemed little likelihood of that.

Mr. Eisenhower himself ordered that "an iron curtain of secrecy" be dropped between Oppenheimer and the nation's nuclear secrets when reinvestigation of the noted scientist's admitted former association with known Communists began in January.

Despite a vigorous dissent by Commissioner Henry D. Smyth, Princeton scientist who worked with Oppenheimer and who declared that Oppenheimer is "completely loyal" and not a security risk, congressional spokesmen said they see no reason to inquire into the AEC majority's rejection of Oppenheimer's appeal.

ISSUES STATEMENT

Oppenheimer issued a brief statement at Princeton, N.J., where he is director of the Institute for Advanced Study.

He said that "Dr. Smyth's fair and considered statement, made with full knowledge of the facts, says what needs to be said."

<input type="checkbox"/> SAC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3 3 2
<input type="checkbox"/> ASAC	
<input type="checkbox"/> PA	
<input type="checkbox"/> C #1	
<input type="checkbox"/> C #2	
<input type="checkbox"/> C #3	
<input type="checkbox"/> APL	
	<input type="checkbox"/> C. CLERK
	<input type="checkbox"/> S. STENO

JERSEY JOURNAL
Jersey City, N.J.

Date 6-30-54 Page 1

SUBMITTED BY THE NEWARK FIELD DIVISION

SEARCHED.....	INDEXED.....
SERIALIZED.....	FILED.....
JUN 30 1954	
FBI - NEWARK	
7-21111	

100-319368-53

Not Quitting At Institute

Oppenheimer to Push Cosmic Ray Study in Princeton

Staff Correspondent.

PRINCETON — Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer, atomic scientist whom the Atomic Energy Commission has designated a security risk, said today that he plans to remain at his post as director of the Institute for Advanced Study here — and continue his research in fundamental physics. Oppenheimer has been institute director since October, 1947.

Oppenheimer said he had no intention of resigning from the directorship and had no indication that a resignation would be requested.

Herbert H. Maass, chairman of the institute's board of trustees, had refused earlier to comment on reports that Oppenheimer was expected to resign and said he did not expect to make any statement on the subject until after a meeting of the board of trustees, scheduled for next month.

No Appeal Plan

Oppenheimer said he does not know whether he can appeal the AEC decision, but he has no plans to do so. His contract as a consultant to the AEC ends at midnight.

Oppenheimer said the "blank wall" drawn between him and the nation's atomic secrets will be "obviously a considerable bother, but it won't keep me from looking at the things I'm most interested in."

He said the things which "stimulate my curiosity are pretty far removed from the practical and therefore from classification." Oppenheimer said he is presently "puzzled, by and has been puzzling about" some "very

remarkable recent observations in cosmic rays."

"I may not be able to move freely," he said, "but that has nothing to do with thinking freely."

President Comments

In Washington meanwhile, President Eisenhower told a news conference that he asked the AEC last year to investigate Oppenheimer again because he had received a disturbing report about him.

The President declined to go into any detailed evaluation of the commission's action. He said the decision was made in normal procedure by men he trusted and that he had not studied their findings in any detail.

And if that course is taken, Eisenhower said he would go to Attorney General Brownell to find out what his prerogatives and responsibilities are in the matter.

Refers To AEC

He declined to answer a question as to whether he felt the country "was safer and more secure now that Oppenheimer is no longer working for us."

Such a question, the President said, should be addressed to the AEC.

The Atomic Energy Commission ruled 4 to 1 late yesterday that the physicist must be denied access to national secrets because of "substantial defects of character" and "imprudent and dangerous associations . . . with known subversives."

Cites Smith Dissent

In a statement issued through his attorneys in New York, Oppenheimer declared that the dissenting opinion of AEC Commissioner Henry D. Smyth, former physics chairman at Princeton University, "says what needs to be said."

Oppenheimer added his hope, however, that scientists will be used "with humanity, with wisdom and with courage," and that their counsel "will be heard."

There was applause in the House when the AEC decision was announced. The White House was officially silent but members of its staff called the ruling "good."

<input type="checkbox"/> SAC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S #1
<input type="checkbox"/> ASAC	<input type="checkbox"/> S #2
<input type="checkbox"/> PA	<input type="checkbox"/> S #3
<input type="checkbox"/> C #1	<input type="checkbox"/> TRAIN
<input type="checkbox"/> C #2	<input type="checkbox"/> NA
<input type="checkbox"/> C #3	<input type="checkbox"/> C. CLERK
<input type="checkbox"/> APPL	<input type="checkbox"/> S. STENO

NEWARK EVENING NEWS
Newark, New Jersey

Date 6-30-54 Page 1

SUBMITTED BY THE NEWARK FIELD DIVISION

SEARCHED	INDEXED
SERIALIZED	FILED
JUN 30 1954	
FBI - NEWARK	
7-100-319368-54	

Members of the House-Senate atomic energy committee viewed the case as closed and agreed an investigation seems unnecessary.

Protests were expected from scientific groups which have opposed the government's position.

The commission issued two reports indorsing a security board's earlier 2-to-1 recommendation against reinstating Oppenheimer's security clearance which President Eisenhower ordered suspended last December.

'Beyond Prudence'

In one, AEC Chairman Lewis L. Strauss and Commissioners Eugene M. Zuckert and Joseph Campbell charged that Oppenheimer's association with known Communists had extended "far beyond the tolerable limits of prudence and self-restraint." They also said his "falsehoods, evasions and misrepresentations" exposed a "fundamental defect" of character.

With particularly strong lan-

guage, they charged that in lying about an espionage attempt during the war Oppenheimer either committed a "crime" in 1943 or "perjury" during the security board hearings this year.

Smyth, scientist member of the AEC and author of the famed Smyth report on the atomic bomb, attacked the majority arguments as "singularly unimpressive."

Sure of Security

"In these times, failure to employ a man of great talents may impair the strength and power of this country," he said. "Yet I would accept this loss if I doubted the loyalty of Dr. Oppenheimer or his ability to hold his tongue. I have no such doubts."

Smyth conceded it was "inexcusable" for Oppenheimer to lie about a purported 1943 espionage attempt by his friend, Haakon Chevalier. But he sharply disputed the majority's opinion that Oppenheimer's brief meeting with Chevalier in Paris last year proved a "dangerous" continuing association with Communists.

Smyth said, however, that there is no indication in the entire record that Dr. Oppenheimer has ever divulged any secret information, and that the test of a security system is in the results rather than obedience to form.

The majority charged Oppenheimer with a "persistent and willful disregard" of government security regulations but Smyth

suggested the system is "nothing to worship" and deplored the "fear behind" this position.

The commission majority said Oppenheimer's loyalty was not at issue. As the majority saw it, the issue was whether it was in the interest of national security to let Oppenheimer see "some of the most vital secrets in the possession of the United States."

But in a concurring opinion, Commissioner Thomas E. Murray said the "primary issue is the meaning of loyalty. . . . Within the conditions created by the present crisis of national and international security, . . . Dr. Oppenheimer was disloyal."

Discounts H-Bomb View

The majority said no importance was attached to allegations that Oppenheimer hurt the nuclear program by opposing all-out hydrogen-bomb development efforts and, after former President Truman ordered it in 1950, failing to give it his enthusiastic support.

"Dr. Oppenheimer was, of course, entitled to his opinion," said the majority.

The reports revealed the Security Board's decision against Oppenheimer was indorsed by the AEC's general manager, K. D. Nichols. Among other things, Nichols said Oppenheimer's value as an adviser "has declined" with the coming of younger scientists, pointing out that he advised the commission on only six occasions last year.

NEWARK EVENING NEWS
Newark, New Jersey

Date _____ Page _____

SUBMITTED BY THE NEWARK FIELD DIVISION

Oppenheimer loses appeal for clearance

From our wire services

WASHINGTON — Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer yesterday lost his appeal to the Atomic Energy Commission to lift his suspension from access to security ~~data~~. By a 4-1 vote, the commission held that the character and associations of Oppenheimer — famed as the father of the atomic bomb — were such that he should not be allowed to know the newest secrets turned up by government workers in the atomic field.

Three of the commissioners did not question Oppenheimer's loyalty to the United States. But one of them, Thomas E. Murray, expressed the view that regard for security regulations was the test of loyalty of those in highly sensitive positions. Murray said Oppenheimer was not faithful to them and in that sense, "he was disloyal."

SINGLE DISSENT

The single dissent came from Commissioner Henry D. Smyth who said:

"In these times, failure to employ a man of great talents may impair the strength and power of this country. Yet I would accept this loss if I doubted the loyalty of Dr. Oppenheimer or his ability to hold his tongue. I have no such doubts."

At the Capitol, the board's decision was announced to the House by Rep. Cole (R.-N. Y.), chairman of the Senate-House Atomic Energy Committee. It was greeted with considerable applause.

NEWARK STAR LEDGER

NEWARK, N. J.

DATE 6-30-54 PAGE 3

SUBMITTED BY THE NEWARK FIELD DIVISION

149

<input type="checkbox"/> SAC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S #1
<input type="checkbox"/> ASAC	<input type="checkbox"/> S #2
<input type="checkbox"/> PA	<input type="checkbox"/> S #3
<input type="checkbox"/> C #1	<input type="checkbox"/> TRAIN
<input type="checkbox"/> C #2	<input type="checkbox"/> NA
<input type="checkbox"/> C #3	<input type="checkbox"/> C. CLERK
<input type="checkbox"/> APPL	<input type="checkbox"/> S. STENO

100-31936B-55

SEARCHED	INDEXED
SERIALIZED	FILED
JUN 30 1954	
FBI - NEWARK	

At the White House, presidential press secretary James C. Hagerty told reporters "it's an AEC matter" and declined further comment. Hagerty said he had no idea whether the decision could be appealed to the President.

Oppenheimer, 50, teaches at the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton, N. J.

'FAIR STATEMENT'

In a statement issued late last night at his Princeton office, Oppenheimer said "Dr. Smyth's fair and considered statement, made with full knowledge of the facts, says what needs to be said." He added that he would not comment on "the security system which has brought all this about."

Oppenheimer concluded his brief statement by expressing the belief that the nation's scientists would continue to work "to preserve and strengthen this country."

"I know that their counsel, when sought, will be given honestly and freely," he said. "I hope that it will be heard."

The commission acted on Oppenheimer's appeal from a 2-1 security board decision that although Oppenheimer was loyal and discreet, he was a security risk and should be denied further access to atomic secrets.

4 TO 1 VOTE

In the commission's 4-1 vote, the majority was made up of Chairman Lewis L. Strauss, and Commissioners Eugene M. Zuckert, Joseph Campbell and Murray.

The majority opinion, signed by Strauss, Zuckert and Campbell, said at one point:

"In respect to the criterion of 'associations,' we find that his (Oppenheimer's) association with persons known to him to be Communists have extended far beyond the tolerable limits of prudence and self-restraint which are to be expected of one holding the high positions that the government has continuously entrusted to him since 1942. These associations have lasted too long to be

justified as merely the intermittent and accidental revival of earlier friendships."

It was on the basis of associations and of character, the majority said, that it decided that Oppenheimer should not have clearance.

No importance was attached, the majority said, to Oppenheimer's opposition in 1949 to proceeding with the H-bomb program.

As to character, the majority said:

"On the basis of the record before the commission, comprising the transcript of the hearing before the Gray Board as well as reports of military intelligence and the Federal Bureau of Investigation, we find Dr. Oppenheimer is not entitled to the continued confidence of the government and of this commission because of the proof of fundamental defects in his 'character.'"

STAR LEDGER

K, H. J.

DATE _____ PAGE _____

SUBMITTED BY THE NEWARK FIELD DIVISION

SEARCHED.....	INDEXED.....
SERIALIZED.....	FILED.....
JUN 8 0 1954	
FBI - NEWARK	

Oppenheimer May Appeal To President

PRINCETON (AP) — Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer said yesterday "I don't dismiss" the possibility of appealing to President Eisenhower the Atomic Energy Commission's decision barring him access to secret atomic data.

The atomic pioneer said he was surprised by the President's statement he would be listened to if he decided to appeal, and added that the idea "never occurred to me."

Oppenheimer said his present plans are to continue research in fundamental physics, although it will be "a nuisance" not having clearance to many laboratories.

'NOT WELCOME'

There are many private institutions, Oppenheimer said, at which experiments are being conducted for the government and where he is "not welcome" any longer.

Oppenheimer also said he has no intention of resigning as director of the Institute for Advanced Study here.

Oppenheimer's colleagues, among them Dr. Albert Einstein, issued a statement expressing their "complete confidence in his loyalty to the United States."

<input type="checkbox"/> SAO	<input type="checkbox"/> S #1
<input type="checkbox"/> ASAC	<input type="checkbox"/> S #2
<input type="checkbox"/> PA	<input type="checkbox"/> S #3
<input type="checkbox"/> C #1	<input type="checkbox"/> TRAIN
<input type="checkbox"/> C #2	<input type="checkbox"/> NA
<input type="checkbox"/> C #3	<input type="checkbox"/> C. CLERK
<input type="checkbox"/> APTL	<input type="checkbox"/> S. STENO

JERSEY JOURNAL
Jersey City, N.J.

Date 7-1-54 Page 4

SUBMITTED BY THE NEWARK FIELD DIVISION

SEARCHED	INDEXED
SERIALIZED	FILED
JUL 1 - 1954	
FBI - NEWARK	

100-31936B-56

Oppenheimer Praised

Institute Colleagues at Princeton Express Their Confidence in His Loyalty to U. S.

Special to Newark News.

PRINCETON — Dr. Robert Oppenheimer's colleagues at the Institute for Advanced Study expressed "complete confidence in his loyalty to the United States" yesterday in a statement approved unanimously by the Institute's permanent members and professors emeriti.

"loyalty and patriotic devotion" of Dr. Oppenheimer, the Institute's director, who has been denied access to secret government information by the Atomic Energy Commission. Dr. Albert Einstein, signed along with 25 other institute members.

The statement said:

"Now that the official decision concerning the question of Dr.

Oppenheimer's security clearance has been rendered, the undersigned permanent members and professors emeriti of the Institute for Advanced Study consider that in all propriety they may publicly express their feelings concerning Dr. Oppenheimer in the light of the charges brought against him.

Confidence Unimpaired

"We, who have known him as a colleague, as director of our own institution, and as a neighbor in a small and intimate community, had from the first complete confidence in his loyalty to the United States, his discretion in guarding its secrets, and his deep concern for its safety, strength,

and welfare. Our confidence in his loyalty and patriotic devotion remains unimpaired as our admiration for his magnificent public service is undiminished.

"Dr. Oppenheimer has performed for this country service of another kind, more indirect and less conspicuous but nevertheless, we believe, of great significance. For seven years now he has with inspired devotion directed the work of the Institute for Advanced Study, for which he has proved himself singularly well suited by the

unique combination of his personality, his broad scientific interests, and his acute scholarship. We are proud to give public expression at this time to our loyal appreciation of the many benefits that we all derive from our association with him in this capacity.

(Signed):

James W. Alexander, Julian H. Bigelow, Harold F. Cherniss, Freeman J. Dyson, Albert Einstein, Kurt Goedel, Kelly Goldstein, Herman H. Goldstone, Ernst Kantorowicz, E. A. Lowe, Benjamin D. Merrill, Deane Montgomery, Marston Morse, Abraham Pais, Erwin Panofsky, George Placzek, Atle Selberg, Walter W. Stewart, Homer A. Thompson, Oswald Veblen, John Von Neumann, Kurt Weitzmann, Hermann Weyl, Hassler Whitney, E. L. Woodward, Chen-Ning Yang.

<input type="checkbox"/> SAC	<input type="checkbox"/> S #1
<input type="checkbox"/> ASAC	<input type="checkbox"/> S #2
<input type="checkbox"/> FA	<input type="checkbox"/> S #3
<input type="checkbox"/> C #1	<input type="checkbox"/> TRAIN
<input type="checkbox"/> C #2	<input type="checkbox"/> MA
<input type="checkbox"/> C #3	<input type="checkbox"/> C. CLERK
<input type="checkbox"/> ATFL	<input type="checkbox"/> S. SIFNO

NEWARK EVENING NEWS
Newark, New Jersey

Date 7-1-54 Page 16

SUBMITTED BY THE NEWARK FIELD DIVISION

SEARCHED.....	INDEXED.....
SERIALIZED.....	FILED.....
JUL 1 - 1954	
FBI - NEWARK	

100-319368-57

Oppenheimer Verdict

THE decision depriving Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer of clearance as a security risk is now confirmed by the Atomic Energy Commission. In a four-to-one verdict, the AEC upholds the two-to-one finding of the Gray board of inquiry, but is even more severe in its criticism of the scientist.

Where the Gray board was unanimous in concluding that, despite his disregard of security regulations, Dr. Oppenheimer was nevertheless loyal, one member of the AEC definitely holds that on the basis of his conduct he must in this respect be adjudged disloyal.

The standard by which the noted scientist was judged and found wanting is a high one, and properly so. As Commissioner Thomas E. Murray put it:

Where responsibility is highest, fidelity should be most perfect.

The element of possible political prejudice disappears before the fact that two of the three Truman appointees on the AEC joined with the two Eisenhower members in the majority decision. Only one to support the idea that Dr. Oppenheimer should continue to have access to the nation's atomic secrets was the single scientist on

the commission, Dr. Henry D. Smyth of Princeton. Even he admitted he was disturbed by Dr. Oppenheimer's conduct in relation to Haakon Chevalier, a suspected Communist agent.

The Chevalier incident, says Dr. Smyth, "involved temporary concealment of an espionage attempt and admitted lying, and is inexcusable." He cites that this was 11 years ago. But it is a fact that Dr. Oppenheimer continued relations with Chevalier and visited with him in Paris as late as last December, just prior to the suspension of his security clearance.

The AEC decision was not based on any one incident, but on the cumulative evidence that Dr. Oppenheimer had fallen far short of acceptable standards of reliability, self-discipline and trustworthiness. Hence a scientist of unique achievement and ability, who might have continued to perform outstanding service to his country if he had not been careless of its security, must submit—and rightly—to enforced retirement from a field in which he had distinguished himself.

cc Bureau

NEWARK EVENING NEWS
Newark, New Jersey

Date 7-1-54 Page 14

SUBMITTED BY THE NEWARK FIELD DIVISION

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 630	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3 #1
<input type="checkbox"/> ASAC	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 #2
<input type="checkbox"/> 12	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 #3
<input type="checkbox"/> 13	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 #4
<input type="checkbox"/> 14	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 #5
<input type="checkbox"/> 15	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 #6
<input type="checkbox"/> 16	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 #7
<input type="checkbox"/> 17	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 #8
<input type="checkbox"/> 18	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 #9
<input type="checkbox"/> 19	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 #10

100-319368-58

SEARCHED.....	INDEXED.....
SERIALIZED.....	FILED.....
JUL 1 - 1954	
FBI - NEWARK	

Oppenheimer to stay on job at institute

PRINCETON — Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer said yesterday he plans to stay in his post as director of the Institute for Advanced Study and continue research in fundamental physics.

"I may not be able to move freely but that has nothing to do with thinking freely," said the scientist who was barred from access to secret atom data by a 4-1 vote of the atomic energy commission yesterday as a security risk.

Oppenheimer said the "blank wall" drawn between him and the nation's atomic secrets will be "obviously a considerable bother, but it won't keep me from looking at the things I'm most interested in." He said he is presently puzzled by some "very remarkable recent observations in cosmic rays."

Meanwhile, Oppenheimer's colleagues at the institute expressed "complete confidence in his loyalty to the United States."

"Our confidence in his loyalty and patriotic devotion remains unimpaired as our admiration for his magnificent public service is undiminished," said a statement signed by 26 institute members, including Dr. Albert Einstein.

NEWARK STAR LEADER

NEWARK, N. J.

DATE 7-1-54 PAGE 2

SUBMITTED BY THE NEWARK FIELD DIVISION

<input type="checkbox"/> SAC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S #1
<input type="checkbox"/> ASAC	<input type="checkbox"/> S #2
<input type="checkbox"/> FA	<input type="checkbox"/> S #3
<input type="checkbox"/> C #1	<input type="checkbox"/> TRAIN
<input type="checkbox"/> C #2	<input type="checkbox"/> NA
<input type="checkbox"/> C #3	<input type="checkbox"/> C. CLERK
<input type="checkbox"/> APPL	<input type="checkbox"/> S. STENO

SEARCHED.....	INDEXED.....
SERIALIZED.....	FILED.....
JUL 1 - 1954	
FBI - NEWARK	

105-21021 R-59

'Defects in his character'

President Eisenhower at a news conference yesterday stated that the government will entertain any appeal that Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer might want to make in an effort to reverse the 4-1 ruling of the Atomic Energy Commission refusing him security clearance.

The President's "offer," if such it was, was made in the traditional interests of fair play. However, the possibility that a new appeal may be forthcoming leaves no alternative but to recall the events that led up to the hearings in the first place. These were Dr. Oppenheimer's decision to invite an investigation despite the evidence; and the findings of a special presidential board which ruled him loyal but of questionable security because of "defects in his character."

The board and the commission—composed of fair-minded men who heard the testimony in an atmosphere free from publicity and so-called hysteria—learned that:

He was a fellow-traveler; that he had Communist friends and attended meetings with them; that he was engaged to one woman Communist and married another woman Communist; that his brother and sister-in-law were Communists for a time; and that even after he changed his opinion about communism, he first neglected to tell the government about a Communist friend trying to tap him for atomic secrets, then lied about it, then told the truth.

In view of this record, it is a mystery why Dr. Oppenheimer permitted his supporters to make a cause celebre out of the case.

NEWARK STAR LEDGER

NEWARK, N. J.

DATE 7-1-54 PAGE 8 - Ed.

SUBMITTED BY THE NEWARK FIELD DIVISION

☐ SAC ☒ S #1
☐ ASAC ☐ S #2
☐ PA ☐ S #3
☐ C #1 ☐ TRAIN
☐ C #2 ☐ NA
☐ C #3 ☐ C. CLERK
☐ APPL ☐ S. STENO

SEARCHED.....	INDEXED.....
SERIALIZED.....	FILED.....
JUL 1 - 1954	
FBI - NEWARK	

cc Bureau

Trenton Evening Times

Founded October 12, 1823

Sunday Times-Advertiser

Founded 1823

James Kerney, Editor and Publisher

1873-1934

Subscription rates: Trenton Times, 35 cents a week by Times carrier in city limits; by mail payable in advance, \$1.15 a month or \$12.00 a year. Sunday Times-Advertiser, 10 cents a week by carrier; 15 cents a week, 50 cents a month, \$1.25 for three months, or \$5.00 a year payable in advance, by mail. Trenton Times, daily except Saturdays, Sundays and holidays.

I do the very best I know how, the very best I can and I mean to keep doing so till the end; if the end brings me out all right, what is said against me won't amount to anything.—Abraham Lincoln

Wednesday, June 30, 1954

The Oppenheimer Ruling

From the standpoint of national welfare, it is decidedly unfortunate that the issue of security clearance for Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer has resolved itself into an all-out battle between men of science and men of affairs. In yesterday's ruling, the Atomic Energy Commission exhibited the same split that was evidenced by the Gray personnel security board—a lone scientist, Dr. Henry D. Smyth, voting against the majority in the 4 to 1 verdict denying Dr. Oppenheimer further access to secret data.

In view of the fact that eminent scientists from all parts of the country have been rallying to the support of the Princeton genius and attacking the AEC security system in no uncertain terms, it is hard to see how the nation from this point on can expect the kind of wholehearted technical cooperation that is so plainly essential to sustained progress and development within the atomic field.

The AEC majority makes a big point of Dr. Oppenheimer's associations with Leftists, pinks and Communists. In all fairness, it should be noted, however, that most of the evidence adduced along this line had to do with a period when the United States was an actual ally of Russia in the fight against Nazism and Fascism. And no facts were brought forth tending to show that Dr. Oppenheimer ever used these associations for the purpose of divulging secret information.

"With respect to the alleged disregard of the security system," says Dr. Smyth in his dissenting

100-39368-61

SEARCHED	INDEXED
SERIALIZED	FILED
JUL 1 1954	
FBI - NEWARK	

20

AD DIVISION

denying Dr. Oppenheimer further access to secret data.

In view of the fact that eminent scientists from all parts of the country have been rallying to the support of the Princeton genius and attacking the AEC security system in no uncertain terms, it is hard to see how the nation from this point on can expect the kind of wholehearted technical cooperation that is so plainly essential to sustained progress and development within the atomic field.

The AEC majority makes a big point of Dr. Oppenheimer's associations with Leftists, pinks and Communists. In all fairness, it should be noted, however, that most of the evidence adduced along this line had to do with a period when the United States was an actual ally of Russia in the fight against Nazism and Fascism. And no facts were brought forth tending to show that Dr. Oppenheimer ever used these associations for the purpose of divulging secret information.

"With respect to the alleged disregard of the security system," says Dr. Smyth in his dissenting opinion, "I would suggest that the system itself is nothing to worship. It is a necessary means to an end. Its sole purpose, apart from the prevention of sabotage, is to protect secrets. If a man protects the secrets he has in his hands and his head, he has shown essential regard for the security system."

Dr. Oppenheimer, meanwhile, received word of the adverse decision with this comment: "Our country is fortunate in its scientists, in their high skill and their devotion. I know that they will work faithfully to preserve and strengthen this country."

It is too bad that so many of these scientists will continue to feel that one of their most distinguished colleagues has received a shabby deal. That is a state of mind scarcely conducive to the devoted, single-minded effort which is always a basically important factor in any imaginative search into the realm of the unknown.

100-319368-61

SEARCHED.....	INDEXED.....
SERIALIZED.....	FILED.....
JUL 1954	
FBI - NEWARK	

20

ED DIVISION

Scientists rap Oppenheimer security ban

CHICAGO (AP)—The Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists said yesterday it was "contrary to decency and common sense" for the government to revive old charges against Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer "from the irrelevance to which a brilliant record of national service had finally relegated them."

Discussing the order denying Oppenheimer access to secret material because he associated with Communists in the early days of World War II and later opposed development of the hydrogen bomb, the Bulletin said: "It seems to us a breach of faith on the part of the government to call upon a man to 'assume such heavy responsibilities in full knowledge of his life history and then, after he has demonstrably done his best and given the most valuable services to the nation, to use the facts that were substantially known all the time to cast aspersions on his integrity.'"

Oppenheimer guided the work of U. S. scientists who contributed to the development of the atomic bomb.

The Bulletin delayed publication of its May issue for six days so 16 pages could be added for a thorough discussion of the Oppenheimer case. Oppenheimer is chairman of the Bulletin's board sponsors.

Nearly two score scientists commented on the case in the Bulletin, expressing faith in Oppenheimer's integrity and loyalty.

A special review board has held secret hearings in the case. The only reason given by the administration for removing Oppenheimer's clearance is the general application of new security standards set up after President Eisenhower took over.

Index

NEWARK STAR LEDGER

NEWARK, N. J.

DATE 5-21-54 PAGE 3

SUBMITTED BY THE NEWARK FIELD DIVISION

<input type="checkbox"/> SAC	<input type="checkbox"/> S #1
<input type="checkbox"/> ASAC	<input type="checkbox"/> S #2
<input type="checkbox"/> PA	<input type="checkbox"/> S #3
<input type="checkbox"/> C #1	<input type="checkbox"/> TRAIN
<input type="checkbox"/> C #2	<input type="checkbox"/> NA
<input type="checkbox"/> C #3	<input type="checkbox"/> C. CLERK
<input type="checkbox"/> APPL.	<input type="checkbox"/> S. STENO

SEARCHED.....	INDEXED.....
SERIALIZED.....	FILED.....
MAY 21 1954	
FBI NEWARK	

Oppenheimer Loyalty—Fate Up To Jurors

Board Takes 10-Day Recess To Go Over Testimony Given

WASHINGTON —INS— The loyalty fate of Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer, noted atomic scientist, rested with his jury today after a month-long secret trial on charges that his continued employment by the Atomic Energy Commission endangers the national defense.

The jury consists of Gordon Gray, president of North Carolina University; Thomas Morgan, president of Sperry Corp., and Ward V. Evans chemistry professor at Loyola University of Chicago.

Chairman Gray announced that the special AEC security board has taken a ten-day recess to study the testimony and evidence against Dr. Oppenheimer before rendering a verdict. If the jury rules him a security risk, the scientist may appeal the verdict to an AEC review board.

Dr. Oppenheimer, credited with perfecting the "trigger" to the atomic and hydrogen bombs, was suspended from all sensitive duties by the AEC last December 23.

(JWN)

info: 100-

SH1

"THE TRENTONIAN"

Trenton, N.J.

Date 5-7-54 Page 26

SEARCHED	INDEXED
SERIALIZED	FILED
MAY 27 1954	

100-34936B-63

Oppenheimer's Ivory Tower Will Never Be as Cloistered

BY SAUL PETT

PRINCETON, N.J.—In one sense, Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer is returning to the ivory tower from which he was shaken loose 12 years ago to direct the making of history's first atomic bomb.

Stripped of access to his country's secrets, the famed physicist makes it clear he will now devote himself again to the relatively cloistered life of abstract science.

But in another sense, the ivory tower will never be the same.

For Oppenheimer also makes it clear he will never again be the politically naive professor he was back in the thirties. In those days, he has said, he was so indifferent to the affairs of the world around him he didn't even read newspapers.

"I should think," he says now, "that you wouldn't step twice in the same river. History doesn't repeat itself that way. At least, I've learned to read newspapers since then."

Quip on Press

Is he ever sorry he "learned" to read newspapers?

Dr. Oppenheimer's gaunt, bird-like face broke into a wry grin. His intense blue eyes relaxed. "I think I am."

The scientist, who lost his long fight for security clearance reinstatement because of "fundamental defects of character," was interviewed in the office where he directs—and expects to continue to direct—the Institute for Advanced Study.

He chain-smoked and sidgeted, but then he always has. He talked cautiously and nervously of his future, but only in response to questions. He volunteered little or no information. One got the impression there was much he wanted to say—especially about his own feelings—but didn't because he was reluctant to appear to be seeking sympathy.

Won't Leave U. S.

Would he comment on reports he was so bitter he intended to live and work abroad?

"It is not true," he said, "that I have ever thought of leaving this country, nor can I imagine circumstances under which I would."

But what of his own feelings? Was he bitter? Oppenheimer, refusing to "bare his soul," as he said, declined to answer such questions.

Does he think he had a fair hearing?

"I hope," he said, "people will study the record of this case and reach their own conclusions. I mean not only people interested, but scholars who have a legal background. I think there is something to be learned from it."

Would he make a last appeal of his case to President Eisenhower as the President says he can?

"It is a pretty unusual procedure," he said. "It never occurred to me before. Beyond that, I have no comment."

Discussing his future, he declared:

"Until the war, I was only a

theoretical physicist and teacher. Institute's work nor of mine. Primarily, the institute is not engaged in secret work."

Retains Humor

Although he appeared under great strain, several times in the interview the scientist indicated recent events had not erased his sense of humor. He said he has slept "pretty well" and "has lost only a little weight."

At one point, he pulled out a copy of his latest book, "Science and the Common Understanding," and observed, with a smile, that it came out the same day the transcript of his hearing did and cost the same—\$2.75.

He was asked if his display of humor was an "act" to cover up his real feelings?

"I'm not a very good actor," he said. "I've never been sure I had a sense of humor but I'm sure I never lost it."

Many people have commented that Oppenheimer was a good figure caught in a great tragedy along the lines of epic Greek drama. What did he think?

"In some dramas, a sense of the drama comes from the chorus," he said cryptically.

SUNDAY STAR LEADER

NEWARK, N.J.

RECEIVED BY THE NEWARK FIELD DIVISION

☐ SAC ☐ S #1 ✓
☐ ASAC ☐ S #2
☐ PA ☐ S #3
☐ C #1 ☐ TRAIN
☐ C #2 ☐ NA
☐ C #3 ☐ C. CLERK
☐ APPL ☐ S. STENO

100-319368-4

SEARCHED	INDEXED
SERIALIZED	FILED
JUL 1 1954	
FBI-NEWARK	
T. E. Kelling	

NO REVOLT AMONG SCIENTISTS

Thousands Are Hard at Work on Atomic Jobs

Are American scientists in revolt against building superbombs? Is there any truth to the idea that scientists are a "strange breed," prone to adopt radical creeds? Are they bad security risks?

Questions like these are being asked as a result of the security investigation of Dr. J.

Robert Oppenheimer. There is a lot of talk about the profession that gave this country the A-bomb and the H-bomb.

To clear up such questions, U.S. News & World Report checked the records, consulted scientific leaders and Government officials. Following are the facts about scientists.

All kinds of statements are being made about American scientists just now. Scientists, it is said by some, are in revolt against Government work, are refusing to help develop any more superweapons of destruction.

The impression is given that American scientists as a whole opposed creation of the hydrogen bomb. It is suggested that scientists are a strange breed—natural radicals who have a penchant for strange and revolutionary doctrines.

Investigation of Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer on the ground of past association with Communists is giving rise to the growing interest in scientists.

There is an impression that Dr. Oppenheimer, the man who built the atom bomb, also discovered the H-bomb; that he personally trained most of the coun-

try's atomic scientists and has had a dominant role in the great postwar development of the atomic program.

Dr. Oppenheimer has been described as a sort of indispensable man. Some say that his suspension will cause many scientists in the atomic program to quit Government service.

To find whether or not some of these statements being made are true, U.S. News & World Report sought out the facts from leading scientists and from officials in close association with them and their work. Inquiries produced differing viewpoints, but also brought out much that clarifies the situation. Some of the commonly expressed impressions, and the reaction to such impressions from among leaders in science and Government, follow.

It is said: Scientists as a whole were opposed to developing the hydrogen bomb.

This turns out to be untrue. Among the leaders in the field of atomic science, there was sharp division. Some opposed the bomb. Others favored it. The great majority of scientists were not called on to express their views.

What created a false impression about this was the fact that the General Advisory Committee of Scientists, advising the Atomic Energy Commission, voted in 1949 against a rush program to develop the H-bomb. This group included, besides Dr. Oppenheimer, seven other noted scientists.

But, at the same time, many scientists actively boosted the H-bomb proposal. These included such famous names as



A-BOMB'S OPPENHEIMER



THE BIG BLAST




H-BOMB'S TELLER

DO SCIENTISTS SHUN ATOMIC WORK?

THE RECORD POINTS THE OTHER WAY

Number of scientists and engineers
working on Atomic Energy
Commission projects:



IN 1953,

there were employed
on AEC projects:

1,561 biological and
medical scientists
2,476 chemists
1,704 physicists
768 other
physical scientists
1,623 chemical engineers
1,412 electrical engineers
1,804 mechanical engineers
448 metallurgical engineers
1,786 other engineers

13,582 total

(Figures include staffs of AEC
and its operating commissions)

© 1954, by U. S. News Pub. Corp.

Edward Teller, Ernest O. Lawrence, Kenneth S. Pitzer, Wendell M. Latimer, Luis W. Alvarez, Harold C. Urey, Willard F. Libby, Frederick Seitz and Norris E. Bradbury. Some of the original opponents later helped develop the bomb.

One scientist of note said this:

"The facts are that very few scientists were consulted [about the decision to build the H-bomb] and that the opposition was confined almost exclusively to a small group led by Oppenheimer. Those of us who advocated a vigorous program and helped [AEC Chairman] Lewis L. Strauss get the 'go-ahead,' resent the impression that 'scientists' opposed the program. I am greatly concerned lest the American people get the impression that scientists generally are so foolish as to oppose a program to learn the secrets of nature in an area important to national security."

It is said: Scientists are in revolt against work on atomic weapons, condemning use of such weapons on moral grounds.

Again a statement not borne out by facts. Records of the Atomic Energy Commission show that there were never

ment atomic projects as now. The number, nearly doubled since 1949, represents a large segment of the nation's qualified experts.

A responsible official says: "We've had no trouble" in finding scientists willing to work on AEC projects.

It is conceded by some scientists that many of their number were appalled by the slaughter their A-bomb wrought at Hiroshima and felt moral repugnance against creating such terrible weapons. They questioned the morality of the H-bomb, worked for international outlawing of both A-bomb and H-bomb.

One scientist said there was "some apathy" among his colleagues about going into Government defense work, partly on moral grounds and partly from dislike of Government-imposed secrecy. But he doubted the number refusing to serve has been great. He said any difficulties encountered in adequately staffing AEC projects are due mainly to the general shortage of scientists, rather than to their attitudes.

"I think most scientists feel as I do," he said, "that it is morally wrong to destroy. But we want to extend the frontiers of knowledge as far as we can. And

country asks scientists to develop a new bomb, they'll try it."

It is said: Dr. Oppenheimer is the key man in atomic work, now as in the past. His loss would cripple the nation's defense program.

Here it is discovered that the father of the H-bomb actually is not Dr. Oppenheimer, but Dr. Edward Teller of the Institute for Nuclear Studies of the University of Chicago. It was Dr. Teller who, after leading fellow scientists in supporting the H-bomb, was put in charge of its development.

Dr. Oppenheimer, since completing his A-bomb work, has played chiefly an advisory role, as a member of the General Advisory Committee and, later, until suspended, as an AEC consultant. Although many scientists praise his work, they deny his indispensability.

One scientist said: "Dr. Oppenheimer has not contributed technically to the hydrogen program recently. Nuclear physicists are like baseball players. After 35, they're no good. Their originality loses out. They get to know all the answers, or why something can't be done. All of the important things in this field were

his work before 1920. He's done very little since." Dr. Oppenheimer is 50.

It is said: The investigation of Dr. Oppenheimer will scare other scientists out of Government work.

Many scientists doubt this. One said: "It's a great injustice to say that scientists would sit on their hands about going ahead with the nation's problems if Oppenheimer is attacked. There are hearings like this all the time. This is all standard procedure. I'm not alarmed."

Another scientist said the Oppenheimer investigation would raise questions in the minds of many scientists whether it's worth the sacrifice to work for the Government when a man "gets castigation rather than praise." But, he said: "There's not going to be any strike. Scientists are not going to rise up and resign in a body."

Yet another scientist had this to say: "This whole [Oppenheimer] thing does have a real effect on the thinking of scientific people. They are very much disturbed. It will make many hesitant to give their opinions. But will scientists pull out? I don't think so, but this makes scientists less willing to go in."

The Federation of American Scientists, in a statement by its executive committee on the Oppenheimer case, said: "It is especially disturbing to find that attitudes and opinions on technical and policy matters expressed by Oppenheimer in the normal course of advisory duties are cited as bases for questioning his veracity, conduct and loyalty. This kind of attack threatens to stifle at its source the expression of independent views by Government personnel, advisers and consultants."

This statement, critical as it was of the Oppenheimer investigation, contained no threat by the Federation's 1,000 members to quit Government work.

One Government official recalled that in an important laboratory the entire scientific staff threatened to quit if one of their number, under suspicion, were ousted as a security risk. He was ousted. Nobody quit.

It is said: Scientists are a different breed. They tend to radical ideologies, are more prone to accept Communism than most people.

Scientists—and many who know them best—deny this emphatically. Although scientists, trained to think critically, may be more willing than some to consider radical ideas, their defenders say this same training helps them to reject such ideologies as Communism.

"Scientists are not a separate breed of men," Morton Grodzins of the University of Chicago wrote in the "Bulletin of the


8 SCIENTISTS WHO SAID "YES" TO THE H-BOMB



LAWRENCE
U. of California



SEITZ
U. of Illinois



UREY
U. of Chicago



LIBBY
U. of Chicago



PITZER
U. of California



BRADBURY
U. of California



LATIMER



ALVAREZ

the Western culture, cherish a set of Western values. Some, such as the value of freedom, they find indispensable to their own work and work satisfaction. These values may not lead to extravagant national loyalty. But they certainly militate against an identification with the Soviet Union."

Another scientist said this: "Among scientists, as in other intellectual groups, there will be some who hold extreme political views—Communism for example. I do not believe that the proportion among scientists is at all large."

It is said: Scientists are bad security risks because they don't believe in secrecy and lean to ideas of world government instead of national patriotism.

This really stirs up the scientists and also brings denials from officials. They point out that very few scientists have been convicted of giving atomic secrets to Russia. Most of those convicted were born in countries other than those where they worked—like Klaus Fuchs.

Gordon Dean, former AEC Chairman, was asked one time: "Does the scientist have less regard for loyalty to his country than other people?"

His answer was: "I don't think that you can say that scientists are an entirely different breed in that respect."

The late Senator Brien McMahon (Dem.), of Connecticut, former chairman of the congressional Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, once took issue with a remark "about the scientists who were eager to take all secrets out of the country to Moscow."

"I found no such disposition in any atomic scientist," the Senator said.

Scientists do have a "distaste for classification" of scientific information, one of them conceded. "But," he added, "like anyone else, if they are convinced that secrecy is a patriotic duty they'll observe it."

It is said: U. S. is losing ground in the atomic race for lack of scientists.

That there is a national shortage of scientists is admitted. Howard A. Meyerhoff, executive director of the Scientific Manpower Commission, cites surveys showing a shortage of 5,000 to 10,000 scientists and 35,000 to 40,000 engineers in the U. S. This he regards as a more serious threat to America's atomic program than any reluctance by scientists to serve the Government.

However, officials and scientists alike point out, this does not mean the U. S. is losing ground to Russia or any other country. The scientific shortage is worldwide. Atomic experts are quick to remind questioners that the U. S. got both the A-bomb and the H-bomb first. And

Oppenheimer Called Loyal By 26 Princeton Colleagues

"Our confidence in his loyalty and patriotic devotion remains unimpaired, and our admiration for his magnificent public service is undiminished," said a statement signed by twenty-five institute members including Dr. Albert Einstein.

his loyalty and patriotic devotion remains unimpaired at our admiration for his magnificent public service is undiminished.

"Dr. Oppenheimer has performed for this country service of another kind, more direct and less conspicuous, but nevertheless, we believe of great significance. For seven years he has with inspired devotion directed the work of the Institute for Advanced Study; for which he has proved himself singularly well suited by the unique combination of his personality, his broad scientific interests, and his acute scholarship.

"Proud" to Speak Out
"We are proud to give public expression at this time to our loyal appreciation of the many benefits that we all derive from our association with him in this capacity."

In addition to Dr. Einstein, the following signed the statement:

Harold P. Carrigan, Donald H. Henderson, Jr., Benjamin D. Merrill, Edwin Paulsen, Alvin A. Thompson, J. L. Woodard, James H. Woodberry, Melville Brown, Abraham F. Ben-Zur, Arthur W. Brown, Abraham F. Winkler, Morris Goodman, J. A. Lauer, Walter H. Marshall, Earl McWhorter, John A. Alexander, Julian W. Simpson, John A. Fagan, Kurt G. Gammann, John A. Chas. Fagan, Fred G. Fagan, Orest Fagan, Joseph Fagan, and their wives and families.

"We, who have known him as a colleague, as director of our institution, and as a neighbor in a small and intimate community, had from the first complete confidence in his loyalty to the United States, his discretion in guarding its secrets and his deep concern for its safety, strength and welfare. Our confidence in

New York Herald Tribune
7/1/54

100-379368-66

SEARCHED INDEXED
SERIALIZED FILED
JUL 10 1964
FBI - NEW YORK

Index

Now Working on Cosmic Rays

Oppenheimer Won't Appeal or Resign

By Walter Kerr

WASHINGTON, June 30.—Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer said today that he will not appeal yesterday's 4 to 1 decision of the Atomic Energy Commission that he is a security risk and not entitled to clearance for access to restricted data.

The fifty-year-old nuclear scientist, who directed the wartime laboratory that built the first atom bomb, reported by telephone from Princeton, N. J., that the thought had never occurred to him.

He accepted the verdict with evident disappointment, but said in reply to a question that he had no intention of resigning his position as director of the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton.

For the present and for the immediate future he will devote his attention to a physics problem that has excited his imagination. It relates to what he describes as a "remarkable event" that has been observed recently in cosmic rays.

"I have been puzzling over it for a week or two," he said this afternoon, after returning to Princeton from New York where he had consulted with his attorneys.

No Eisenhower Comment

"It is quite unanticipated and unparalleled. It is trying to tell us something if we could only read and understand it."

The possibility of an appeal was raised by a newspaper man in a question put to President Eisenhower at his press conference this morning. First, however, the President was asked whether he cared to comment on the commission's decision.

He said that he did not. He said that the decision was reached in the course of normal procedure and that it was made by men whom he trusted, but he added that he himself had not studied the findings and the final verdict.

There was equal reluctance to discuss the case in commission circles. There, the predominant feeling was that an end had come to an unpleasant task.

President Eisenhower was asked whether he felt that the country was safer and more secure "now that Dr. Oppenheimer no longer is working for us."

The President declined to answer. He referred the question to the commission, saying that they are responsible for this and that they have a very delicate and tough job to do.

Case Regarded as Closed

Another reporter wondered whether the President considered the case closed or whether he would, in the event it were made, consider a plea from Dr. Oppenheimer.

The President replied that

any citizen who believes himself abused has a right to appeal and, of course, if he wanted to appeal, he would be listened to. He thought that in this particular case he would perhaps refer the matter to the Attorney General for an analysis and for a ruling as to the President's prerogatives, authorities and responsibilities.

Since Dr. Oppenheimer will not appeal and since it had never occurred to him to do so, the case is in fact regarded as closed so far as Washington is concerned.

The findings remain:

By the Personnel Security Board, headed by Dr. Gordon Gray, president of the University of North Carolina. Three to nothing that Dr. Oppenheimer is a loyal citizen who demonstrated an unusual ability to keep secrets to himself. Two to one that he is a security risk because of his conduct and associations, susceptibility to influence, "disturbing" conduct in the hydrogen bomb program, and "lack of candor."

H-Bomb Factor Ignored

By Maj. Gen. Kenneth D. Nichols, general manager of the A. E. C.: reaffirmation of the Gray Board recommendation.

By the A. E. C.: 4 to 1 that Dr. Oppenheimer is a security risk because of his character and associations. Silence by three commissioners on the

question of loyalty. Disputed by a fourth commissioner: positive loyalty by the fifth. Oppenheimer's conduct was regarded by the four majority commissioners, while the minority commissioner declared allegations not supported by evidence.

The commissioners who concurred in the verdict were Rear Adm. L. Strauss, chairman; M. Zuckert, Joseph C. and Thomas E. Murray; minority member was Dr. D. Smyth.

The majority members of the Gray board were Dr. Gray, Thomas A. Morgan, Dr. V. Evans dissented.

Press Comment on Oppenheimer

By The Associated Press

Following are excerpts from newspaper comment on the Atomic Energy Commission's refusal Wednesday to clear Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer for access to restricted government information:

"The New York Times": "... the Commission rests its case on ... grounds which it believes to be of fundamental importance: first, its finding of 'substantial defects of character,' and second, evidence of association with known Communists that have 'extended far beyond the tolerable limits of prudence and self-restraint.' ... To Dr. Smyth it is important to consider the strict surveillance long pursued by the government over Dr. Oppenheimer's activities and 'the fact that there is no indication in the entire record that he ever

weight of the judgment of four experienced and able Commissioners ... is on one side. ...

"New York World-Telegram and Sun": "In this field, so highly secret and so fundamental to the nation's security, the only wise course for the public is to accept the decision of those who have the most responsibility—even though it may have tragic and painful aspects."

"Washington Evening Star": "The final judgment against Dr. Oppenheimer is, in a sense, the American tragedy of 1954. He is a victim of the conspiratorial age in which we live. ... The men whose unenviable duty it was to sit in judgment had to balance the interests of an individual against the interests of the security of the United States. ...

"Nashville Tennessean": "Is all the data that he knows to be

lists have come to his side and deplored the decision that designates him a security risk. Apparently they have not read the complete record."

"The San Diego Union": "For a man entrusted with these high secrets there should be absolutely no question of influence by outside interests."

"The Nashville Banner": "By no stretch of the imagination ... can it be charged that Oppenheimer has been the target of political smear or partisan attack."

100-39368-67

INDEXED
FILED
JUL 2 1954
FBI - NEWARK
Kelly
-39368-6

he had consulted with his
counselors.

No Eisenhower Commemoration

"It is quite unanticipated
unparalleled. It is trying to tell
us something if we could only
read and understand it."

Case Regarded as Closed

Another reporter wondered
whether the President consid-
ered the case closed or whether
he would, in the event it were
made, consider a plea from Dr.
Oppenheimer.

The President replied that three

by Maj. Gen. Kenneth D.
Nichols, general manager of the
A. E. C. reaffirmation of the
Gray Board commendation.

By the A. E. C. 4 to 1 that
Dr. Oppenheimer is a security
risk because of his character
and associations. Silence by
three commissioners on the

Press Comment on Oppenheimer

By The Associated Press

Following are excerpts from
newspaper comment on the
Atomic Energy Commission's
refusal Wednesday to clear Dr.
J. Robert Oppenheimer for ac-
cess to restricted government
information:

"The New York Times": . . .
the Commission rests its case
on . . . grounds which it
believes to be of fundamental
importance: first, its finding of
"substantial defects of charac-
ter," and second, evidence of
association with known Com-
munists that have "extended
far beyond the tolerable limits
of prudence and self-restraint."

. . . To Dr. Smyth it is im-
portant to consider the strict
surveillance long pursued by the
government over Dr. Oppen-
heimer's activities and "the fact
that there is no indication in
the entire record that he ever
divulged any secret informa-
tion." . . . In this case honest
men have disagreed. But it must
be noted that . . . the solid

weight of the judgment of four
experienced and able Commis-
sioners . . . is on one side. . .

"New York World-Telegram
and Sun": In this field, so highly
secret and so fundamental to
the nation's security, the only
wise course for the public is to
accept the decision of those who
have the most responsibility—
even though it may have tragic
and painful aspects.

"Washington Evening Star":
The final judgment against Dr.
Oppenheimer is, in a sense, the
American tragedy of 1954. He is
a victim of the conspiratorial age
in which we live. . . . The men
whose unenviable duty it was to
sit in judgment had to balance
the interests of an individual
against the interests of the se-
curity of the United States. *

"Nashville Tennessean": Is all
the data that he knows to be
rendered useless because of a
guilty-by-association verdict,
based on speculation rather
than proof? . . . As far as we
can discern, Dr. Oppenheimer
is the same man he was when
he gave all of his energy and in-
tellect to making the atomic
bomb. . . . If there is any
change, it is in the national at-
titude toward men of science.

"Albany Knickerbocker News":
An examination of the lengthy
reports convinces us that had
he not been a scientist, and so
distinguished a scientist, he
would have been unceremoni-
ously tossed out of the atomic
picture long ago.

"The Detroit News":—Dr.
Oppenheimer flouted certain . . .
rules. The transgression was no
more tolerable in him than in
any lesser man if general respect
for the system is to be preserved.

"The Detroit Free Press": We
think the Atomic Energy Com-
mission acted for the best. . .


It seems to us that as a pattern
it very definitely demonstrates
him to be a man much too
fallible in his judgments and
breadth of understanding to be
trusted with important matters.

"Albuquerque Journal": One
of the tragic circumstances in
the Oppenheimer case is that
literally hundreds of top scien-

tists have come to his side and
deplored the decision that des-
ignates him a security risk. Ap-
parently they have not read the
complete record.

"The San Diego Union":—For
a man entrusted with these high
secrets there should be absolutely
no question of influence by out-
side interests.

"The Nashville Banner": By
no stretch of the imagination
can it be charged that
Oppenheimer has been the tar-
get of political smear or partisan
attack.



INDEXED
FILED
JUL 10 1954
FBI NEWARK

Kelly
-31936B-67

NEW YORK Herald Tribune

18

Thursday, July 1, 1954

The A. E. C. Verdict

That the Atomic Energy Commission should have rendered its decision promptly in the case of Dr. Oppenheimer—and rendered it by a 4-to-1 majority—helps greatly to clear the air. In upholding the recommendations of the Gray report the A. E. C. takes a position which, in the light of given facts, seems to be the only one it could have taken under the security regulations of the country.

The statement of the majority, signed by Mr. Strauss, Mr. Zuckert and Mr. Campbell, sets forth the simple proposition that "a government official having access to the most sensitive areas of restricted data and to the innermost details of national war plans and weapons must measure up to exemplary standards of reliability, self-discipline and trustworthiness." It cites six specific examples of Dr. Oppenheimer's conduct, revealed by the record, which indicate that he failed to maintain such standards. In a dissenting opinion Dr. Smyth interprets each of these incidents in a way more favorable to Dr. Oppenheimer; but the decision of the majority to withhold access to restricted data appears unescapable.

The majority avoid many of the more subtle and confusing questions raised by the Gray board. The issue of whether or not Dr. Oppenheimer gave "enthusiastic support" to the development of the H-bomb is omitted. The discussion of the difference between "loyalty" and "security risk" is largely done away with. What is said is simply that the standards required by the security regulations—required of the greatest as well as the least—have not been met. Mr. Murray, it is true, examines in a concurrent opinion the issue of disloyalty, defining it in a somewhat special sense, not as carrying the implication of adhesion to an alien system, but as being "not faithful to the restrictions on the associations of those who come under the security regulations." Within this definition he finds Dr. Oppenheimer failing the test of loyalty. Such an approach goes outside the framework of the existing security system. The majority kept, instead, to the plain path of common sense and accepted standards.

The matter can be expected to end here. None can fail to sense the tragic overtones of a case which, judged with scrupulous fairness by men of the highest stature, resulted in a verdict against one who contributed so nobly to America's victory in war. What weighs over everything else is the danger in which America finds itself. It is confronted by an enemy as implacable as resourceful, adopting every means of infiltration and subversion, taking advantage of the smallest carelessness or weakness to work its fatal poison. Special standards, special laws and regulations, are called for in such a time.

The A. E. C. is in a position to be supremely aware of the mortal Communist threat. In the Oppenheimer case the majority of its members have acted so as to avoid, as far as humanly possible, any flaw in the security regulations that might betray us now or later.

SAT

18

100-31436

SEARCHED	INDEXED
SERIALIZED	FILED
JUL 2 1954	
FBI - NEWARK	
T. E. Kelly	

100-39368-68

MATTER OF FACT

By JOSEPH and STEWART ALSOP

Operation Don't Argue!

WASHINGTON. To the Soviet enemy, the transcript in the case of Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer has revealed many secret matters. To the American scientific community, this same transcript has made an even more dangerous revelation.

In brief, it has shown that Dr. Oppenheimer really got into trouble, not because of his alleged defects of character, but because he gave his government honest, informed, usually sensible but unwelcome advice.

The chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, Adm. Lewis Strauss, has gone to great lengths to give a different impression. "Defects of character" was the theme of his bitter opinion against Oppenheimer. And to a disturbed and protesting scientist of Los Alamos laboratory, the stronghold of our weaponry, Strauss wrote:

"The Atomic Energy Commission does not believe that any government servant—scientist, engineer or administrator—should slant his advice or temper his professional opinion because of apprehension that such advice or opinion might be unpopular now or in the future."

Naturally, however, the scientists are testing these assurances by Adm. Strauss against the record compiled by his own subordinates. That record begins, of course, with the commission charge against Dr. Oppenheimer, with its ugly hints about the H-bomb controversy. And that record continues through the massive transcript, with attack after attack on Dr. Oppenheimer's advice to his government, Dr. Oppenheimer's stand on the H-bomb, in which he was of course joined by a majority of other American scientific leaders, is only a small part of the story.

For example, Maj. Gen. Charles Roscoe Wilson testifies that one of the reasons why he "felt impelled to go to the Director of Intelligence to express my concern" was because of "my awareness that Dr. Oppenheimer was interested in what I call the internationalizing of atomic energy, this at a time when the United States had a monopoly." It did not matter, naturally, that this interest of Dr. Oppenheimer's was shared by E. M. Baruch. It was interest that did not suit people like Gen. Wilson.

Again, there is the matter of the long-range detection system. Among the secrets the transcript discloses is the fact that a long-range detection device for nuclear explosions had already been developed in war time by Dr. Oppenheimer's Los Alamos team. But no bouquets are handed to Dr. Oppenheimer for this quite remarkable achievement.

On the contrary, he is hectorred at great length because he had advised his government that the air-sample method of long-range

detection was more important than seismographic or barometric methods. This, too, had upset the air staff, which took a different view. And, of course, it did not matter that in this instance Dr. Oppenheimer's advice was wholly correct.

Then there is the Vista story. Here, Dr. Oppenheimer's sin was to suggest a change in the then-existing arrangement, which made the whole existing atomic stockpile the monopoly asset of the Strategic Air Command. He wanted the stockpile divided, instead, into three parts—one part for S. A. C., one part for Tactical Air and other use on the battlefield, and one part as reserve.

To be sure, Dr. Oppenheimer knew what the generals seemed not to have known, that the grim era of atomic plenty would soon permit such a division of the stockpile. To be sure, the thinking developed by Dr. Oppenheimer and others in the Vista report is now, generally speaking, the official thinking of the Pentagon. But the generals' toes were trodden on by Dr. Oppenheimer's premature correctness, and suspicions were aroused.

Finally, there is the shocking Lincoln story. Here the transcript shows the Air Force venomously opposing all efforts to organize a serious air defense of the United States—"sabotaging" is the ugly word used by the distinguished Dr. Gregory Zacharias. And here the transcript shows, too, that in this present year of doubtful grace, Dr. Oppenheimer was solemnly charged with probable disloyalty because he wanted his country to be defended against Soviet air-atomic power.

Indeed, with the sole exception of the H-bomb debate, time has proven that all Dr. Oppenheimer's advice to his government was sound and good. But it was not to borrow Adm. Strauss' word "popular" advice. And its unpopularity quite clearly and directly generated the bad feeling, the nasty whispering, the sinister public hints, which in turn made possible Adm. Strauss' ultimate attack on Dr. Oppenheimer.

All but one or two of the basic facts showing supposed defects in Dr. Oppenheimer's character were known in war time at Los Alamos; and were known, too, when Strauss and the other members of the A. E. C. unanimously reaffirmed Dr. Oppenheimer's clearance in 1947. What then are the scientists to think? The stale controversies so endlessly aired, the A. E. C. prosecutor's constant effort to attribute evil motives to Dr. Oppenheimer's position in those controversies, have inevitably made the scientists think that the Strauss letter to Los Alamos is "less than candid."

Copyright, 1954, E. Y. Bernal Tribune Inc.

100-319368-69

SEARCHED	INDEXED
SERIALIZED	FILED
JUL 14 1954	
FBI - NEW YORK	

NY Handwritten
7/14/54

100-31936

Scientists can be blinded

A group of atomic scientists has come up with a proposal to revise the standards of security clearance since "loyal people at all levels of responsibility in the atomic energy program . . . might well be indicted by the same kind of standards as were applied to Dr. Oppenheimer."

The implication here, of course, is that the standards applied to the security investigation of Dr. E. Robert Oppenheimer, the "father" of atomic energy, were something less than fair. Totally ignored by these scientists is the fact that two non-partisan groups of men, known for their impartiality and fairness and operating in an atmosphere of calm and quiet, devoid of hysteria, issued similar majority findings in the Oppenheimer case.

Also ignored by these scientists is the fact that it was Dr. Oppenheimer himself who permitted his supporters and friends to make a cause celebre of the case despite his admitted Communist associations, failure to adhere to security rules, and other lapses.

One of the points made by the scientists, is "the unquestioned right of dissent, including the right of dissent after an administrative decision has been taken."

No one questions this right to dissent, but merely whether a person who disagrees with government policy should be given the green light of security in work involving the government's program.

Certainly the Government has not only the right, but the duty to eliminate all those persons from government service who cannot be depended upon to give their fullest and unquestioned support to a policy that involves the welfare of the nation.

*Newark Star
Ledger-7/27/54*

110-31736

100-319343-70

1954
T. Kelly

Oppenheimer Expects To Continue At Princeton Institute He Directs

Despite Signs Of Strain He Retains Humor And His Privacy

Editorial Note: What of the J. Robert Oppenheimer, and what the Atomic Energy Commission has going on? Will he be back in his ivory tower? What does he think are the chances of his case? Will he be able to return to the work which directed building of the atom bomb with his plane.

PRINCETON — AP — In one sense, Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer is returning to the ivory tower from which he was shaken some 17 years ago to direct the making of history's first atomic bomb.

Stripped of access to his country's secrets, the famed physicist makes it clear he will now devote himself again to the relatively cluttered life of abstract science.

But in another sense, the ivory tower will never be the same.

For Oppenheimer also makes it clear he will never again be the politically naive professor he was back in the thirties. In those days, he has said, he was so indifferent to the affairs of the world around him he didn't even read newspapers.

"I should think," he says now, "that you wouldn't step twice in the same river. History doesn't repeat itself that way. At least, I've learned to read newspapers since then."

Is he ever sorry he "learned" to read newspapers?

Dr. Oppenheimer's gaunt, bird-like face broke into a very grin.

His Intense Blue Eyes Relaxed. "I Think I Am."

The scientist, who lost his long fight for security clearance reinstatement because of "fundamental defects of character," was interviewed in the office where he directs—and expects to continue to direct—the Institute of Advanced Study.

Like the rest of the building, the office was serene. Somewhere upstairs, Albert Einstein was working alone in a small room on his profound theories. In Oppenheimer's office, the blackboard was clean. Books were neatly piled on his conference table and desk. Behind the desk, big windows opened on to broad lawns and the soothing shade of tall maples.

The office was serene. The man in it wasn't.

He chain-smoked and fidgeted, but then he always has. He talked cautiously and nervously of his future, but only in response to questions. He volunteered little or no information. One got the impression there was much he wanted to say—especially about his own feelings—but didn't because he was reluctant to appear to be seeking sympathy.

To Work Abroad?

Would he comment on reports that he was so bitter he intended to live and work abroad?

"It is not true," he said, "that I have ever thought of leaving this country, nor can I imagine circumstances under which I would."

But what of his own feelings? Was he bitter? Did he feel mistreated by the government he had worked for? Is there a deep, abiding sense of hurt? Oppenheimer, refusing to "bare his soul," as he said, declined to answer such questions.

Does he think he had a fair hearing?

"I hope," he said, "people will study the record of this case and reach their own conclusions. I mean not only people interested but scholars who have a legal background. I think there is something to be learned from it."

Will He Appeal?

Would he make a last appeal of his case to President Eisenhower — as the President says he can?

"It is a pretty unusual procedure," he said. "I never occurred to me before. Beyond that, I have no comment."

Does he consider the case closed?

"No comment."

Does he think his case provides any kind of a lesson for other scientists?

Oppenheimer smiled and said

Return To Ivory Tower Indicated By Scientist In Rare Interview

The question reminded him of the time in 1945 he endorsed the first legislation providing for atomic security regulations. Many of his colleagues, Oppenheimer said, thought the bill was "harsh and oppressive" but he thought it necessary. The act didn't pass. "One night," he said, "I showed a copy of the bill to my wife. She said, 'Robert, you keep your nose out of those atoms.'"

As in what lesson might have been gained from his case, Oppenheimer referred the reporter to a previous statement, in which he said of America's scientists:

"...I hope that the fruit of their work will be used with humanity, with wisdom and with courage. I know that their counsel when sought will be given honestly and freely. I hope that it will be heard."

With a complete absence of dramatics, Oppenheimer discussed his future.

"Until the war," he explained, "I was only a theoretical physicist and teacher. During the war, I ran a laboratory (Los Alamos). Since the war, I have not been running any labs but I've had to worry about the directions research and development were taking and to give counsel to the government."

"This phase of my life is now concluded."

In returning to abstract science, he said, he hoped to pursue his curiosity about a new discovery in cosmic rays. "I don't understand it," he said. "Maybe I never will."

Will the "blank wall" drawn by the government between him and classified data impede his work? He said he thought it would be impeding "very little" but added, "You never know; you can't judge the importance of facts you don't know."

Safe Still Guarded

He said he will continue to discuss common problems with colleagues at the Institute. In the past, some of those discussions have included classified material.

"That will now cease," the physicist said. "It has, in fact, already ceased. But that was not a very serious aspect of the Institute's work nor of mine. Primarily, the Institute is not engaged in secret work."

Until about a year and a half ago, there was a safe in Oppenheimer's outer office guarded day and night by guards assigned by

The safe contained many of his own, highly secret papers as well as those of other scientists.

The safe has been removed "less conspicuous spot" in building and is still guarded by AEC men. Oppenheimer said removal at the time had nothing to do with his own case. Obviously, however, he will no longer be able to examine its papers, studying his own.

Although he appeared in great strain, several times in interview the scientist indicated recent events had not erased sense of humor. He said he slept "pretty well" and has only a "little weight."

At one point, he pulled out a copy of his latest book, "Science and the Common Understanding" and observed, with a smile, that came out the same day the transcript of his hearing did and the same—\$2.75.

Drama From The Chorus

He was asked if his display of humor was an "act" to cover his real feelings?

"I'm not a very good actor," said. "I've never been sure I have a sense of humor but I'm sure never lost it."

Many people have commented that Oppenheimer was a good actor, that he was a great tragedian along the lines of epic Greek drama. What did he think?

"In some dramas, a sense of the drama comes from the chorus," he said cryptically.

How did he feel in the last 18 months having his character subjected to a wholesale, internal analysis by the government at every one of millions of people who could afford the price of a newspaper?

Oppenheimer grinned and said the question reminded him of young physicist, a friend, who getting his medical examination for admission to the Army, was asked, "do you have the feeling people are staring at you?"

The young physicist said he did. The room was full of people staring at him.

"In answer to your question, Dr. Oppenheimer said, "I have the sense of it to the extent to which it is true."

One left the room with the impression that this was a sharp, honed, precisely shaped answer whose real meaning was strictly the private affair of J. Robert Oppenheimer.

WVS

T. Kelly

100-31936B-71

Presented 1993

**James Kerney, Editor and Publisher
1873-1934**

Subscription rates-Terms: **Time:** 25 cents a week by **Time:** carrier to city limits by mail payable in advance, \$1.50 a month or \$12.00 a year. **Outside Time:** **Advertiser:** 25 cents a week by carrier 50 cents a week. 25 cents a month, \$1.25 for three months, or \$3.00 a year payable in advance, by **Mail.** **Times Times:** daily except Saturdays, Sundays and holidays.

I do the very best I know how, the very best I can
and I mean to keep doing so till the end; if the end brings
me out all right, what is said against me won't amount
to anything.—Abraham Lincoln

Monday, June 28, 1954

Crisis In Science

"Los Alamos Is in Flames."

Nearly 500 scientists at the Atomic Energy Commission's key installation have signed a "bitter, but closely reasoned" attack on the majority findings of the Gray board barring Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer from further government work.

At other AEC laboratories, the reaction is as sharp, if less formal. The Federation of American Scientists and the venerable American Physical Society have joined the swelling chorus of protest.

The scientists, on whom the Administration is depending to keep this country in the running in the atomic arms race, are not so concerned with the fate of Dr. Oppenheimer as they are with the standards of security by which he, and they, are judged.

Of course, they don't believe the Princeton scientist's lack of enthusiasm for the H-bomb project delayed it unnecessarily any more than they believe he was "less than candid." But the truth or falsity of these charges doesn't concern them so much as their total irrelevancy in a security proceeding.

Haven't others been "less than candid" and lacked enthusiasm? Does that make them security risks, too? And wasn't Dr. Oppenheimer cleared on every material point? Unanimously, the Gray board found him loyal and discreet.

One of the AEC's most valued consultants summed up the reaction of the scientific community this way:

"There'll be no strike, of course; but I find my enthusiasm dropping to zero just when lack of enthusiasm has become illegal. And my lack of enthusiasm is likely to be total when my contract comes up for renewal."

In the midst of all this turmoil, along comes Defense Secretary Wilson — the man who said he couldn't use Dr. Oppenheimer even before the Gray board's findings were reported — and tells us there is a shortage of scientists.

Small wonder!

100-319368-72

40-3143613-72

FILED INDEXED
MAY 1954
FBI - W. VA.
Hilly - 4771

Congress Plans Own Inquiry If Oppenheimer Is Cleared

By DAVID LAWRENCE

WASHINGTON, June 20.—Was Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer an unconscious instrument of Soviet policy or an actual espionage agent or a loyal but misguided scientist?

These questions, which were raised concretely in a letter from William Liscum Borden to J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the F. B. I., on Nov. 7, 1953, started the re-examination of all records and files by the Atomic Energy Commission in order to determine if the noted scientist could be given clearance or should be denied it as a "security risk."

From January, 1949, until June 1, 1953, Mr. Borden, now an assistant to the manager of the Westinghouse Company's atomic power division, was the executive director of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy. A man with a brilliant war service as an Army pilot and a fine record as a law school graduate, Mr. Borden had the complete confidence of the late Sen. McMahon, Democrat, of Connecticut, who was chairman of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy.

After many years of reading of the classified information and evidence to which he had had access while in the government, Mr. Borden endeavored to assess the degree of likelihood as to "whether he (Oppenheimer) became an actual espionage and policy instrument of the Soviets." Mr. Borden's conclusion was this: "My opinion is that, more probably than not, the worst is in fact the truth."

Congress Watching A. E. C.

Since that letter was written a special board headed by Dr. Gordon Gray, now president of the University of North Carolina and formerly Secretary of the Army in the Truman administration, has ruled unanimously on their findings of fact, but by a 2 to 1 vote has denied Dr. Oppenheimer security clearance, too. The dissenting member, Dr. Ward V. Evans, a chemistry professor, thought that Dr. Oppenheimer had learned a great deal since his earlier indiscretions and wouldn't make the same mistakes again and should be given clearance. Now it is up to the Atomic Energy Commission of five members to review the recommendations of the special board. Judging by the sentiment in Congress, if the Atomic Energy Commission does grant security clearance, the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy will hold extensive hearings which so far as drama and public interest are concerned could conceivably overshadow the recent McCarthy hearings.

This correspondent has just finished an examination of the 292 printed pages of the official transcript—approximately 400,000 words—of the testimony before the special board which heard all the evidence from the Oppenheimer case on both sides. This writer's conclusion is that the most charitable interpretation which can be placed on the case and complicated behavior of Dr. Oppenheimer is that in the evidence is that he was never intentionally disloyal but that his actions were clouded in the official record.

Whom he wanted to protect, Dr. Oppenheimer failed to report the facts promptly to his government, and even five months later did not tell the whole story, despite the urgent pleas of the security officer of the Army. The scientist two months later, under pressure, finally disclosed what he knew to Gen. Groves, head of the atomic bomb project. Then Dr. Oppenheimer confessed that what he previously had told the security officer was a lie. Lawyers say this constitutes a felony under Federal law. Dr. Oppenheimer claims now he was an "idiot" to do what he did, and it is plain that the security clearance he got in 1947 in spite of all this derogatory information was given largely for expediency reasons, that is, Gen. Groves felt he was so valuable to the atomic energy project he should be given the benefit of the doubt. Inside the government it was conceded at the time that Dr. Oppenheimer couldn't have gotten clearance on a military security basis alone and that the F. B. I. Director also had "reservations."

Repetition of Testimony

Another strange development occurred in June, 1949, when after Dr. Oppenheimer had testified under oath in secret session before the House Un-American Activities Committee that a certain scientist was a Communist, he wrote a letter for publication in a newspaper flatly contradicting his own sworn testimony, and later justified what he did on the ground that he didn't want to hurt the scientist's chances of keeping his job at the university where he worked, and besides the Congressional testimony hadn't been released to the public anyhow.

Dr. Oppenheimer has admitted contributing many thousands of dollars to Communist front organizations and causes prior to 1942, and that he associated with several Communists and fellow travelers while engaged in war work. The record shows that as late as 1951 he had not terminated his meetings with a man whom he knew had been accused of being a Communist and who had been involved in the original attempt at espionage in 1943.

In a nutshell, Dr. Oppenheimer felt he himself was a better judge than any one else whether any security was being compromised by his acts. Some of his fellow scientists, who testified to their belief in his loyalty and who said they do not consider him a security risk, stated that they thought his standards had been wrong and that they wouldn't apply to them in the way he did.

A Pattern of Conduct

The official record contains many references to what is called a "pattern of conduct" which, apart from the indiscretions mentioned above, caused Maj. Gen. Roscoe Wilson—deputy to Gen. Groves, and later to Gen. Nichols, of the Atomic Energy Commission—to be so disturbed about what he called Dr. Oppenheimer's "pattern of action" that early in 1951 he went to the director of intelligence of the Air Force saying he was worried about it. This was the first time that the word "pattern" was used in connection with Dr. Oppenheimer's conduct.

100-37368-73

SEARCHED	INDEXED
SERIALIZED	FILED
JUN 2 1954	
FBI - NEWARK	
TELETYPE	

even the degree of likelihood as to whether he (Oppenheimer) became an actual espionage and policy instrument of the Soviets. Mr. Borden's conclusion was this: "My opinion is that, more probably than not, the worst is in fact the truth."

Congress Watching A. E. C.

Since that letter was written a special board headed by Dr. Gordon Gray, now president of the University of North Carolina and formerly Secretary of the Army in the Truman administration, has ruled unanimously on their findings of fact, but by a 2 to 1 vote has denied Dr. Oppenheimer security clearance, too. The dissenting member, Dr. Ward V. Evans, a chemistry professor, thought that Dr. Oppenheimer had learned a great deal since his earlier indiscretions and wouldn't make the same mistakes again and should be given clearance. Now it is up to the Atomic Energy Commission of five members to review the recommendations of the special board. Judging by the sentiment in Congress, if the Atomic Energy Commission does grant security clearance, the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy will hold extensive hearings which so far as drama and public interest are concerned could conceivably overshadow the recent McCarthy hearings.

This correspondent has just finished an examination of the 892 printed pages of the official transcript—approximately 400,000 words—of the testimony before the special board which heard all the evidence from the witnesses on both sides. This writer's conclusion is that the most charitable interpretation which can be placed on the strange and complicated behavior of Dr. Oppenheimer as revealed in the evidence is that he was never intentionally disloyal but that his actions, as disclosed in the official record, permit the inference by the board that he might unwittingly become involved in disloyalty because of his peculiar standards of judgment when there is a conflict between loyalty to a friend and loyalty to his own government. The special board's verdict was that Dr. Oppenheimer was and is loyal but constitutes a "security risk" under existing regulations.

That Dr. Oppenheimer admits that he lied to a security officer of the United States Army in August and September, 1943, and also refused to give him information about an attempt at espionage in this country by the Russian government because he didn't think the plot had succeeded, and because it involved a close friend

known before the House Un-American Activities Committee that a certain act was a Communist, he was a letter for publication in a newspaper fully contradicted his own sworn testimony—and later justified what he did on the ground that he didn't want to hurt the scientist's chances of keeping his job at the university where he worked, and besides the Congressional testimony hadn't been released to the public anyway.

Dr. Oppenheimer has admitted contributing many thousands of dollars to Communist front organizations and causes prior to 1943, and that he associated with several Communists and fellow travelers while engaged in war work. The record shows that as late as 1953 he had not terminated his meetings with a man whom he knew had been accused of being a Communist and who had been involved in the original attempt at espionage in 1943.

In a nutshell, Dr. Oppenheimer felt he himself was a better judge than any one else whether any security was being compromised by his acts. Some of his fellow scientists, who testified to their belief in his loyalty and who said they do not consider him a security risk, stated that they thought his standards had been wrong and that they wouldn't apply to them in the way he did.

A "Pattern of Conduct"

The official record contains many references to what is called a "pattern of conduct" which, apart from the indiscretions mentioned above, caused Maj. Gen. Roscoe Wilson—deputy to Gen. Groves, and later to Gen. Nichols, of the Atomic Energy Commission—to be so disturbed about what he called Dr. Oppenheimer's "pattern of action" that early in 1951 he went to the director of intelligence of the Air Force saying he was worried about it. This referred not only to alleged retardation in the development of the H-bomb by Dr. Oppenheimer but to his opposition to nuclear powered airplanes, and a course of action on other military matters that were deemed by Gen. Wilson to be detrimental to the offensive power of the Strategic Air Command of the United States.

The Oppenheimer case can never be decided fairly on the basis of one incident or on what admirers or critics testify as to their personal impression of his loyalty or security from their own acquaintance or observation, but only on the basis of all the available evidence, direct and circumstantial, specific acts as well as views—the whole 400,000 words—which has to be examined before reaching a final verdict.

100-31868-72

SEARCHED	INDEXED
SERIALIZED	FILED
JUN 2 1954	
FBI - NEWARK	

TELETYPE

**Oppenheimer Leaves
For Caribbean Holiday**

NEW YORK —AP— Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer, atomic scientist recently barred from top government security secrets, left last night on a four-week Caribbean vacation.

The former advisor to the atomic energy commission was accompanied by his wife, son and daughter. They left Idlewild Airport on a Pan American plane en route to San Juan, Puerto Rico. From there they will go to St. Croix in the Virgin Islands.

72-100-31936

TRENTON EVENING TIMES
TRENTON, N.J.

DATE 7-20-54 PAGE _____

SUBMITTED BY NEWARK OFFICE

100-31936B-74

AUG 3,

T. Kelly

AUGUST 1, 1956

Deny Smyth Intends to Quit A. E. C.

WASHINGTON, July 31 (AP).—Dr. H. D. Smyth, senior member of the Atomic Energy Commission, does not plan to resign now and any possible resignation "will be a long time away," a source close to the family said today.

The A. E. C. meanwhile termed as "completely unfounded" a report that Dr. Smyth would resign soon to return to Princeton University. Dr. Smyth now is traveling through the West visiting A. E. C. scientific establishments, and was not immediately available for comment.

The informant, who declined to be identified, said Dr. Smyth is "very anxious" to counteract recent speculation that he is planning to quit because he was the sole A. E. C. commissioner who opposed the recent ruling to bar physicist J. Robert Oppenheimer from security information.

The latest published report of his resignation said Dr. Smyth would return to Princeton to teach physics. He is on continuing leave from Princeton, where was head of the physics department, but the informant said he has not taught regularly for fourteen years.

Dr. Smyth, the scientific member of A. E. C., has served continuously since May 31, 1949. His present term runs until June 30, 1956.

The A. E. C. said Princeton had denied knowing the source of the latest story.

Dr. Smyth, an appointee of former President Truman, recently told a Congressional committee that he felt there was an air of tension under the present chairman, Adm. Lewis L. Strauss, an Eisenhower appointee. Dr. Smyth joined two other commissioners in opposing a move to give Adm. Strauss a stronger legal position as "principal officer" of the commission.

"N. Y. World-Telegram & Sun"

Oppenheimer Backer Quits AEC Over Policy

Smyth to Take Princeton Post

By the United Press.

PRINCETON, N. J., July 31.—Atomic-bomb expert Dr. Henry DeWolf Smyth, a member of the Atomic Energy Commission who recently criticized his colleagues for terming Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer a security risk, is planning to quit the AEC.

Friends indicated yesterday that Dr. Smyth was planning to resign because of disagreement over AEC policy. As one friend put it, "they don't play so clean in those Washington backwoods."

Acquaintances said Dr. Smyth, a consultant for the Manhattan Project which developed the atomic bomb, would take a "big scientific job" at Princeton University.

Dr. Smyth, 56, is considered one of the nation's leading atom experts. He is author of the authoritative "Atomic Energy for Military Purposes," the official War Department report on atomic bombs published in 1945. The only scientist presently



DR. H. DE WOLFE SMYTH.

on the five-man AEC, Dr. Smyth last month criticized his fellow commission members for recommending that Dr. Oppenheimer be barred from atomic secrets.

100-31936 B-75

SEARCHED	INDEXED
SERIALIZED	FILED
JUL 31 1956	
FBI - NEWARK	

FBI men quiz Oppenheimer as plane lands

NEW YORK (AP)—Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer arrived by plane from Puerto Rico last night and was questioned for 30 minutes by three men identified by an airport attache as FBI agents.

Oppenheimer, who was barred from atomic secrets by the government as a security risk, had been vacationing in the Virgin Islands with his wife and two children.

An FBI spokesman said the bureau could not "give out any information at this time" when queried about the airport incident.

Oppenheimer left Idlewild Airport in a private car before reporters could talk to him.

The Princeton physicist, one of the leading scientists in the development of the atomic bomb during World War II, was denied access to government secrets by the Atomic Energy Commission June 29.

NEWARK STAR LEDGER

NEWARK, N. J.

DATE 8/30/54 PAGE 1

SUBMITTED BY THE NEWARK FIELD DIVISION

<input type="checkbox"/> SAC	<input type="checkbox"/> S #1
<input type="checkbox"/> ASAC	<input type="checkbox"/> S #2
<input type="checkbox"/> PA	<input type="checkbox"/> S #3
<input type="checkbox"/> C #1	<input type="checkbox"/> TRAIN
<input type="checkbox"/> C #2	<input type="checkbox"/> NA
<input type="checkbox"/> C #3	<input type="checkbox"/> C. CLERK
<input type="checkbox"/> APPL	<input type="checkbox"/> S. STENO

100-379368-76

SEARCHED	INDEXED
SERIALIZED	FILED
AUG 30 1954	
FBI - NEWARK	

G-Men Quiz Oppenheimer

Question Princeton Scientist at Airport on Arrival From Vacation

NEW YORK UN—Three men reported to be FBI agents questioned Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer as he arrived at Idlewild Airport last night.

The three men, who were identified as FBI agents by an airport attache, talked for 20 minutes with the scientist who has been barred from atomic secrets by the Government as a security risk.

Oppenheimer who arrived by plane from Puerto Rico, had been vacationing in the Virgin Islands with his wife and two children.

He left the airport in a private car before newsmen could talk to him. He declined comment when reached later by telephone at his Princeton, N.J., home.

FBI Silent

An FBI spokesman, queried about the airport incident, said the bureau could not "give out any information at this time."

Oppenheimer, who is director of the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton, has said he will continue research in fundamental physics despite the action of the Atomic Energy Commission last June 29 denying him access to government secrets.

The AEC voted four-to-one against Oppenheimer, one of the leading scientists in development of the atomic bomb during World War II.

The AEC's action came after a special three-man security board decided that while Oppenheimer was loyal, he was a security risk. Most of the data against Oppenheimer involved associations with known Communists.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SAC	<input type="checkbox"/> S #1
<input type="checkbox"/> ASAC	<input type="checkbox"/> S #2
<input type="checkbox"/> PA	<input type="checkbox"/> S #3
<input type="checkbox"/> C #1	<input type="checkbox"/> TRAIN
<input type="checkbox"/> C #2	<input type="checkbox"/> MA
<input type="checkbox"/> C #3	<input type="checkbox"/> C. CLERK
<input type="checkbox"/> APPL	<input type="checkbox"/> S. STENO

NEWARK EVENING NEWS
Newark, New Jersey

Date 8-30-54 Page 9

SUBMITTED BY THE NEWARK FIELD DIVISION

100-3936877

SEARCHED.....	INDEXED.....
SERIALIZED.....	FILED.....
AUG 30 1954	
FBI - NEWARK	

F. B. I. MEN QUIZ ATOM SCIENTIST

Oppenheimer Examined On Return From Trip

New York, Aug. 29 (AP) — Three men reported to be F. B. I. agents questioned Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer as he arrived at Idlewild Airport last night.

The three men, who were identified as F. B. I. agents by an airport attache, talked for 20 minutes with the scientist who has been barred from atomic secrets by the Government as a security risk.

Oppenheimer, who arrived by plane from Puerto Rico, had been vacationing in the Virgin Islands with his wife and two children.

He left the airport in a private car before newsmen could talk to him. He declined comment when reached later by telephone at his Princeton, N. J. home.

An F. B. I. spokesman, queried about the airport incident, said the Bureau could not give out any information at this time.

Oppenheimer, who is director of the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton, has said he will continue research in fundamental physics despite the action of the Atomic Energy Commission last June 29 denying him access to Government secrets.

The A. E. C. voted 4-to-1 against Oppenheimer, one of the leading scientists in development of the atomic bomb during World War II.

The A. E. C.'s action came after a special 3-man security board decided that while Oppenheimer was loyal, he was a security risk. Most of the data against Oppenheimer involved associations with known Communists.

☐ SAC ☐ S #1 ✓
☐ ASAC ☐ S #2
☐ SA ☐ S #3
☐ C #1 ☐ SPAIN
☐ C #2 ☐ MA
☐ C #3 ☐ C. CLERK
☐ APPL ☐ S. STENO

100-373678

SEARCHED	INDEXED
SERIALIZED	FILED
AUG 31 1954	
FBI - NEW YORK	

"BERGEN EVENING RECORD"

Hackensack, N. J.

DATE 8-30-54 PAGE 1

Submitted by Newark Division

Oppenheimer, FBI Talk at Airport

NEW YORK (AP)—Three men reported to be FBI agents questioned Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer as he arrived at Idlewild Airport last night.

The three men, who were identified as FBI agents by an airport attache, talked for 20 minutes with the scientist who has been barred from atomic secrets by the government as a security risk.

Oppenheimer, who arrived by plane from Puerto Rico, had been vacationing in the Virgin Islands with his wife and two children.

He left the airport in a private car before newsmen could talk to him. He declined comment when reached later by telephone at his Princeton, N. J., home.

An FBI spokesman, queried about the airport incident, said the bureau could not "give out any information at this time."

Oppenheimer, who is director of the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton, has said he will continue research in fundamental physics despite the action of the Atomic Energy Commission last June 29 denying him access to government secrets.

The AEC voted four-to-one against Oppenheimer, one of the leading scientists in development of the atomic bomb during World War II.

The AEC's action came after a special three-man security board decide that while Oppenheimer was loyal, he was a security risk. Most of the data against Oppenheimer involved his associations with known Communists.

ELIZABETH DAILY JOURNAL
Elizabeth, N.J.

Date 8-30-54 Page 12

Submitted by the Newark Field Division

☐ SAC ☒ [initials]
☐ ASAC ☐ S #2
☐ PA ☐ S #3
☐ C #1 ☐ TRAIN.
☐ C #2 ☐ DA
☐ C #3 ☐ C. CLERK
☐ QTR ☐ S. STENO

100-37868-77
SEARCHED INDEXED
SERIALIZED FILED
SEP 1 - 1954
FBI - NEWARK
12

A Frightening Story

A STORY that verges on the incredible will appear in print on September 30. It is contained in what promises to be a sensational book, "The Hydrogen Bomb", by James R. Shepley and Clay Blair, Jr., Washington news men.

It is the terrifying story of how close our country came not to making the hydrogen bomb. If we had not done so — well, President Eisenhower is quoted in the book as having said this spring that "If the Soviets had beaten us to the hydrogen bomb, Soviet power would today be on the march in every quarter of the globe". As it turned out, the Russians did beat us by a few months to the development of a hydrogen bomb that could be carried in an airplane.

The authors appear to feel that the villain in the drama was the famed A-bomb scientist, Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer, who used his great prestige to fight development of the hydrogen bomb every step of the way. He was supported by other noted scientists and key government officials. Their attitude was expressed in a report of the Atomic Energy Commission's general advisory committee in 1949:

"We all hope that by one means or another, the development of these weapons can be avoided. We are all reluctant to see the United States take the initiative in precipitating this development."

The authors offer this partial explanation for this state of mind:

"Much of the struggle . . . seemed to flow out of the guilt felt by some of the key atomic scientists at having created the atomic weapon in the first place. It was abetted by uncritical acceptance . . . of the theory that because a man might solve a mathematical formula containing 27 unknowns, he is especially equipped as a statesman to determine the affairs of a nation."

In other words, the opponents of the hydrogen bomb hoped that if our country did not develop the bomb, the Russians might not do so either!

But if the story is as true as the story whose naivete and argument almost cost us our country, there are heroes in it, too. They are such men as Lewis Strauss, the present head of the Atomic Energy Commission, who never gave up the struggle to get the hydrogen bomb program going (although it was known in 1945 that such a bomb was theoretically possible, we did not get going on it until 1950) and Dr. Edward Teller, the refugee Hungarian scientist who pitted himself against Dr. Oppenheimer and relentlessly promoted the hydrogen bomb project. They include the late U.S. Senator Brien McMahon, who joined Strauss and Teller, and his lieutenant, William Borden, executive director of the joint congressional committee on atomic energy who finally put the finger on Oppenheimer. There are others, too, whose good sense helped to save our country from disaster, men like the flier, Gen. Pete Quesada, and the scientists, Drs. E. O. Lawrence, Wendell M. Latimer and Louis W. Alvarez, supporters of Teller.

However, it is not the debate over developing the hydrogen bomb that is well nigh incredible. That feeling must be reserved for some of the minor incidents, like the discovery made by Mr. Strauss:

"An FBI report crossed Strauss' desk alerting the AEC to the fact that a man who had been a Communist until a few months before his employment at Los Alamos, was then custodian of the top secret library at the weapons laboratory. He had been employed while Oppenheimer was director . . . and had been certified repeatedly . . . as 'essential' in connection with wartime draft deferment. At the time of his employment, the report noted, this man who was 'essential' to the development of the atomic bomb had been a street-railway motorman."

Or what happened to Dr. Teller, after his first hydrogen bomb had been exploded. A moving picture of this explosion was prepared at Los Alamos, where Dr. Teller was disliked for his campaign to develop the H-bomb. Say the authors:

"Los Alamos personnel who supervised the preparation of the movie were careful to see that no scenes included Edward Teller."

The Los Alamos people did not want him to get credit! The book should cause something like a hydrogen bomb explosion when the story it relates begins to sink in.

"Passaic Herald News"

Passaic, N.J.

Date 9-23-54 Page 12 - El

Submitted by Newark Division

<input type="checkbox"/> SAC	<input type="checkbox"/> S #1
<input type="checkbox"/> ASAC	<input type="checkbox"/> S #2
<input type="checkbox"/> PA	<input type="checkbox"/> S #3
<input type="checkbox"/> C #1	<input type="checkbox"/> TRAIN
<input type="checkbox"/> C #2	<input type="checkbox"/> NA
<input type="checkbox"/> C #3	<input type="checkbox"/> C. CLERK
<input type="checkbox"/> AFPL	<input type="checkbox"/> S. E. T. O.

100-319368-80

SEARCHED	INDEXED
SERIALIZED	FILED
SLP 27 1954	
FBI - NEWARK	

Info.

A high-contrast, black and white photograph of a man and a woman sitting together. The man, on the right, is wearing a suit and tie, and the woman, on the left, is wearing a patterned jacket. Both are smiling at the camera.

Will Work at Princeton

Niels Bohr Arrives, Terms Oppenheimer Case 'Sad'

Dr. Niels Bohr, the Danish physicist who first figured out the shape of the atom, arrived in New York yesterday, wincing as he was asked about his old friend, Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer.

Flashed by reporters' questions about the Norwegian line Oslorjord, which docked at 1:48 p. m. from Copenhagen, Dr. Bohr leaned forward in his lounge chair, wrinkled his bushy brows and said in his normally hushed voice:

"Professor Oppenheimer is an old friend and I have tremendous admiration for him as a scientist and for his service to his country. I am very sorry that anything of this kind should come up, at all. It is very sad. It is unfortunate for every one."

Was At Los Alamos

Dr. Bohr, a sixty-eight-year-old Nobel Laureate, was a consultant to the Los Alamos, N. M., atomic bomb laboratory of which Dr. Oppenheimer was director during the war. After escaping from Nazi-occupied Norway in a small boat in 1943, he came here with the news that that Germany was thinking of making a bomb. This spurred United States atomic development.

Facing reluctantly of his own part in the bomb project and waving aside all questions of technical merits, physics, etc. Dr. Teller stated that only a "small number of scientists" like himself were outside of Government's control. Theoretical physicist and leader in the establishment of an international organization of scientists, Dr. Teller

the progress of civilization. He warned that nuclear energy, used wrongly, could wipe out life on earth.

Dr. Bohr was asked if, considering both these possibilities, he ever felt sorry that nuclear energy had been released.

"You cannot stop scientific development although one may feel many ways about it at one time or another," he said, twinkling and emphasizing his point with his pipe. Dr. Mohr was accompanied by his wife and Aage Petersen, an assistant.

SEARCHED _____ INDEXED _____
SERIALIZED SI FILED _____
OCT 1 - 1954
FBI - NEWARK



Dr. Niels Bohr, Danish physicist and nuclear scientist, arriving with Mrs. Bohr to address the National Industrial Conference meeting Oct. 13-15 in New York.

Will Work at Princeton

Niels Bohr Arrives, Terms Oppenheimer Case 'Sad'

By Earl Ubell

Dr. Niels Bohr, the Danish physicist who first figured out the shape of the atom, arrived in New York yesterday, wincing as he was asked about his old friend, Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer.

Prodded by reporters' questions aboard the Norwegian liner Calsoford, which docked at 1:45 p. m. from Copenhagen, Dr. Bohr leaned forward in his lounge chair, wrinkled his bushy brows and said in his normally hushed voice:

"Professor Oppenheimer is an old friend and I have tremendous admiration for him as a scientist and for his service to his country. I am very sorry that anything of this kind should come up at all. It is very sad. It is unfortunate for every one."

Was At Los Alamos

Dr. Bohr, a sixty-eight-year-old Nobel Laureate, was a consultant to the Los Alamos, N. M., atomic bomb laboratory of which Dr. Oppenheimer was director during the war. After escaping from Nazi-occupied Norway in a small boat in 1943, he came here with the news that that Germany was thinking of making a bomb. This spurred United States atomic development.

Speaking reluctantly of his own part in the bomb project and waving aside all questions on technical nuclear physics, Dr. Bohr termed himself only a "theoretical scientist." He is now director of Copenhagen's Institute of Theoretical Physics and a leader in the establishment of an international nuclear research center in Geneva.

Dr. Bohr was on his way yesterday to Princeton, N. J., to spend a month and a half with scientists at the Institute for Advanced Study, of which Dr. Oppenheimer is director. Later he will participate in Columbia

University's Manhattan celebration.

Wrapping his top coat around him and tugging slightly at his wool peaked cap, Dr. Bohr predicted that in the long run atom power "holds great promise" for

the progress of civilization. He warned that nuclear energy, used wrongly, could wipe out life on earth.

Dr. Bohr was asked if, considering both these possibilities, he ever felt sorry that nuclear energy had been released.

"You cannot stop scientific development although one may feel many ways about it at one time or another," he said, twinkling and emphasizing his point with his pipe. Dr. Bohr was accompanied by his wife and Aage Petersen, an assistant

100-39361

SEARCHED	INDEXED
SERIALIZED	FILED
OCT 1 - 1954	
FBI - NEWARK	



Danish Scientist Says Oppenheimer Case Sad

NEW YORK, Sept. 23 (AP) — Danish physicist Niels Bohr says the recent decision barring Prof. Robert Oppenheimer of Princeton, N. J. from access to government atomic secrets "is very sad."

Bohr, who arrived here for a brief visit with American scientists, said "Prof. Oppenheimer is an old friend, and I have tremendous admiration for him as a scientist and for his service to his country. I am very sorry that anything of this kind should come up at all. It is very sad. It is unfortunate for everyone."

The big, genial scientist, who won the 1922 Nobel Prize for deductions about construction of the atom and who helped out on the United States' first A-bomb, will spend six weeks at the Institute of Advanced Studies in Princeton, where Oppenheimer is director.

<input type="checkbox"/> SAC	<input type="checkbox"/> S #1 ✓
<input type="checkbox"/> ASAC	<input type="checkbox"/> S #2
<input type="checkbox"/> PA	<input type="checkbox"/> S #3
<input type="checkbox"/> C #1	<input type="checkbox"/> TRAIN
<input type="checkbox"/> C #2	<input type="checkbox"/> NA
<input type="checkbox"/> C #3	<input type="checkbox"/> C. CLERK
<input type="checkbox"/> APPL	<input type="checkbox"/> S. STENO

"PATERSON EVENING NEWS"

Paterson, N. J.

DATE 9-28-54 PAGE 18

Submitted by Newark Division

100-39368-2

SEARCHED	INDEXED
SERIALIZED	FILED
SEP 29 1954	
FBI - NEWARK	

Oppenheimer Gets Princeton Backing

NEW YORK, Oct. 2 (UP) — Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer, barred from the government's atomic secrets as a security risk, has been given a unanimous vote of confidence by trustees of the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton, N. J.

Oppenheimer was reelected director of the institute yesterday by the government, financial and scientific leaders who comprise the Board of Trustees. Approval of the scientist was unanimous.

Among the trustees at the meeting was Rear Admiral Lewis L. Strauss, chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, who recently ruled the atom physicist should be deprived of access to government secrets. Strauss was the first to leave the meeting. He did not say if he had cast a ballot.

"Paterson Evening News"
Paterson, N. J.

Date 10-2-54 Page :

Submitted by Newark Division

☐ SAC ☐ S #1 ✓
☐ ASAC ☐ S #2
☐ PA ☐ S #3
☐ C #1 ☐ TRAIN
☐ C #2 ☐ RA
☐ C #3 ☐ C. CLERK
☐ APPL ☐ S. STENO.

SEARCHED	INDEXED
SERIALIZED	FILED
OCT 1 1954	
FBI - NEWARK	

Info.

100-37368-83

Oppenheimer Is Re-elected

Renamed Director of
Institute at Princeton
by Trustees

Special to Newark News.

NEW YORK—Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer, whose federal security clearance has been revoked, yesterday was re-elected director of the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton.

Dr. Oppenheimer was continued as director, a post he has held since 1947, by vote of the institute's 13-man board of trustees at a meeting at the Uptown Club. The vote was reported to have been unanimous.

The controversial physicist's re-election amounted to a vote of confidence for him from the federal, financial, business and scientific leaders who are trustees of the institute.

Strauss Present

Among trustees at the closed meeting was the institute's president, Rear Adm. Lewis L. Strauss, who is also chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. Strauss was among the majority on the AEC which last June voted 4-1 to bar Dr. Oppenheimer from further access to atomic secrets on the ground he was a security risk even though a loyal American.

Strauss said last month there was no connection between the AEC decision and Dr. Oppenheimer's job at Princeton.

The trustees' action was disclosed soon after the lengthy meeting by Chairman Herbert Maass, who announced that Dr. Oppenheimer and all other officers had been re-elected. Asked if the vote was unanimous, Maass said "quite."

<input type="checkbox"/> SAC	<input type="checkbox"/> S #1
<input type="checkbox"/> ASAC	<input type="checkbox"/> S #2
<input type="checkbox"/> FA	<input type="checkbox"/> S #3
<input type="checkbox"/> C #1	<input type="checkbox"/> TRAIN
<input type="checkbox"/> C #2	<input type="checkbox"/> NA
<input type="checkbox"/> C #3	<input type="checkbox"/> C. CLERK
<input type="checkbox"/> ATTL	<input type="checkbox"/> S. STENO.

NEWARK EVENING NEWS
Newark, New Jersey

Date 10-23 Page 1

SUBMITTED BY THE NEWARK FIELD DIVISION

SEARCHED	INDEXED
SERIALIZED	FILED
OCT 23 1954	
FBI - NEWARK	

100-319368-84

AUTHOR HITS OPPENHEIMER, COLLEAGUES

Strauss tries to 'bury' H-book

WASHINGTON AP — Chairman Lewis L. Strauss of the Atomic Energy Commission tried to suppress a new book sharply criticizing Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer and other principals in the hydrogen bomb program until after their deaths.

This was disclosed yesterday by the co-author of the book, James R. Shepley, and confirmed by Strauss. The book, "The Hydrogen Bomb," says Russia temporarily wrested the atomic lead from the United States in 1953, chiefly because of Oppenheimer.

Shepley, chief of Time magazine's Washington bureau,

related the incident on the NBC television program, "Comment." He said Strauss called him to his office and offered to "buy your manuscript, put it in the safe for 25 years or at least until most of the individuals concerned are dead, and then let it be published."

SHEPLEY said Strauss' motives were "at the highest" because Russia would have had a monopoly on the H-bomb without his efforts. He said he could only surmise Strauss was under "very great pressure and that he wished to shield his sci-

ence from public controversy."

The book charges that Oppenheimer, famed atomic scientist who recently was denied access to atomic secrets, and his supporters "almost destroyed" the balance of atomic power between the United States and Russia by originally opposing the H-bomb.

THE AUTHOR said he rejected Strauss' offer because "things happen too quickly in the atomic era to wait 25 years for a report on how matters in this crucial area of our government have been handled," he said he

reminded the AEC chairman that Strauss himself had said the public was entitled to much important information on atomic affairs.

Shepley said he later learned that Gordon Dean, Strauss' predecessor as AEC chairman, had written Strauss a letter blaming him for the book and demanding that he suppress it. Shepley, who denied the charge, said Dean considered the book an attack on him.

Strauss, reached by a reporter by telephone, generally confirmed Shepley's account of his offer to buy the book but refused to elaborate.

NEWARK STAR LEDGER

NEWARK, N. J.

DATE 9-27-54 PAGE 4

SUBMITTED BY THE NEWARK FIELD DIVISION

<input type="checkbox"/> 100-319368-85	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 24
<input type="checkbox"/> 100-319368-85	<input type="checkbox"/> 25
<input type="checkbox"/> 100-319368-85	<input type="checkbox"/> 26
<input type="checkbox"/> 100-319368-85	<input type="checkbox"/> 27
<input type="checkbox"/> 100-319368-85	<input type="checkbox"/> 28
<input type="checkbox"/> 100-319368-85	<input type="checkbox"/> 29
<input type="checkbox"/> 100-319368-85	<input type="checkbox"/> 30

SEARCHED	INDEXED
SERIALIZED	FILED
SLP 2 74954	
FBI - NEWARK	

100-319368-85

Oppenheimer Given Award

Scientist Honored by Club
in Philadelphia for
Aid to Knowledge

PHILADELPHIA (AP)—Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer has received the Pyramid Club of Philadelphia's achievement award for "unflinching devotion of his own great gifts to the end of increasing man's knowledge."

Dr. Oppenheimer, head of the Institute for Advanced Science at Princeton, and credited with playing a major role in developing the atomic bomb, received the award last night. He said it reaffirms "that spirit of human brotherhood that is the hope of today's world."

Dr. Albert Einstein, also associated with the Princeton institute but unable to attend the ceremony because of "age and health," commended the club for

honoring his colleague "in recognition of his exemplary conduct as a citizen of his country."

Dr. Oppenheimer earlier this year was denied security clearance by the Atomic Energy Commission and removed from all government work on the hydrogen bomb. The AEC ruled that Dr. Oppenheimer was a loyal American but denied him security of clearance on grounds he had associated with individuals of questionable loyalty.

The Pyramid Club is a social and civic organization of prominent Philadelphia Negroes.

SH 1
H

100-319368-26

NEWARK EVENING NEWS
Newark, New Jersey

Date 10-22-54 Page 12

SUBMITTED BY THE NEWARK FIELD DIVISION

SEARCHED	INDEXED
SERIALIZED	FILED
OCT 22 1954	
FBI - NEWARK	

Defends Oppenheimer

Pauling, Nobel Prize Winner, Deplores 'National Ingratitude' During Princeton Visit

Special to Newark News.
PRINCETON — Dr. Linus C. Pauling of Pasadena, Calif., the 33-year-old chemist who two days ago won a Nobel prize, said last night there was "no need to pillory," Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer.

Speaking freely with newsmen, Pauling, who was visiting colleagues in science here, labeled the treatment of Oppenheimer "the worst case of national ingratitude I know." Barring Oppenheimer from atom secrets, he said, was "very damaging to the nation."

Oppenheimer had headed the Los Alamos atom bomb project during the war and had been adviser to the Atomic Energy Commission. He was declared loyal but a security risk. Oppenheimer is director of the Institute for Advanced Study here.

Cites 12 Years' Service

Asserting the charges against Oppenheimer were "trivial," Pauling said Oppenheimer "proved himself by his extraordinarily outstanding services over 12 years." He said "advisers of government, if they are going to be valuable, must be free to express their opinions."

Pauling himself has been under fire several times in the past for alleged Communist affiliations but he has stoutly denied the allegations. On three occasions in 1952, said Pauling, he was denied a passport to travel to scientific meetings in Europe, but finally obtained a limited passport.

The distinguished chemist, director of California Institute of Technology's Gates and Crellin laboratories since 1937, admitted that there had been indications that he might win the Nobel award several weeks ago. But official confirmation came at 4 p.m. Wednesday, 45 minutes before he

was to conduct a seminar for the Cornell University chemistry department.

To Lecture at Princeton

"I had a little trouble with the seminar," Pauling admitted ruefully. He added that the subject of his paper was "Abnormal Hemoglobin Molecules and Their Relation to Disease," and that he will read it again today before the New York section of the American Chemical Society.

Scheduled to deliver four lectures at Princeton University Nov. 15-18, Pauling said he would leave for his home in Pasadena Nov. 20 for a few days rest before the Nobel prize presentation Dec. 10 at Stockholm. He plans to leave Los Angeles Dec. 6 by air for Copenhagen.

<input type="checkbox"/> SAC	<input type="checkbox"/> S #1
<input type="checkbox"/> ASAC	<input type="checkbox"/> S #2
<input type="checkbox"/> PA	<input type="checkbox"/> S #3
<input type="checkbox"/> C #1	<input type="checkbox"/> STAIN
<input type="checkbox"/> C #2	<input type="checkbox"/> ST
<input type="checkbox"/> C #3	<input type="checkbox"/> C. CLARK
<input type="checkbox"/> APP	<input type="checkbox"/> S. STENO

100-31936-87

NEWARK EVENING NEWS
Newark, New Jersey

Date 11-6-54 Page 20

SUBMITTED BY THE NEWARK FIELD DIVISION

FILED	INDEXED
SERIALIZED	FILED
NOV 11 1954	
FBI - NEWARK	

BARRIED SCIENTIST JOINS COMMITTEE

**Oppenheimer Elected To Membership
Of Anti-Communist Group**

New York, Nov. 12 (AP)—Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer, barred from the nation's atomic secrets, has been elected to membership in the American Committee for Cultural Freedom, an avowed anti-Communist group.

The committee announced yesterday that Oppenheimer agreed to accept membership from his home in Princeton, N. J., where he is director of the Institute for Advanced Study.

The A. C. C. F. describes itself as an organization of 200 artists, scholars, scientists, and writers dedicated to a responsible struggle against Communism and all other forms of totalitarianism.

Last June, by a 4-1 vote, the Atomic Energy Commission denied Oppenheimer further access to atomic data. He was charged with persistent and continuing association with Communists.

The Commissioners agreed Oppenheimer was not disloyal, but the majority called him a security risk.

<input type="checkbox"/> SAC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S #1
<input type="checkbox"/> ASAC	<input type="checkbox"/> S #2
<input type="checkbox"/> PA	<input type="checkbox"/> S #3
<input type="checkbox"/> C #1	<input type="checkbox"/> MAIL
<input type="checkbox"/> C #2	<input type="checkbox"/> AA
<input type="checkbox"/> C #3	<input type="checkbox"/> C. CLERK
<input type="checkbox"/> APPL	<input type="checkbox"/> S. STENO

"BERGEN EVENING RECORD"

Hackensack, N. J.

DATE 11/12/54 PAGE 1

Submitted by Newark Division

SEARCHED	INDEXED
SERIALIZED	FILED
NOV 17 1954	
FBI - NEWARK	

100-319368-88

'Shocked' at Suggestion

Oppenheimer Rejected Even Hint of Trading Data With Reds, French Account Says

PARIS (AP)—The leftist weekly magazine France-Observateur has published what it terms an open letter from Hsankou Chevalier to American scientist J. Robert Oppenheimer strongly denying any role by Chevalier in Soviet espionage.

Chevalier was a former professor at the University of California and a close friend of Oppenheimer when he was connected with the school. He was specifically mentioned last June in an inquiry into Oppenheimer's security status by the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission.

The commission finally barred Oppenheimer, a key figure in development of the atomic bomb, from access to the U.S. Government's top secret atomic data.

Report Delayed

The commission's majority report noted testimony in late 1942 or early 1943 that Chevalier told Oppenheimer that one George Elinton had means of getting information to the Russians. While rejecting the idea of giving secrets to the Communists, it was testified, Oppenheimer did not report the incident for months and then did not give Chevalier's name.

Chevalier denied in his letter that he had approached any American scientists to ask them for secrets. Instead, Chevalier

cited one incident early in the war which he said was the only ground for even mentioning his name in connection with Oppenheimer.

Letter's Version

The letter published in the current issue of France-Observateur gave this account of that incident:

Chevalier had a conversation one day in late 1942 or early 1943 with a Shell Oil Co. chemist named George Elinton who was also a friend of Oppenheimer. In the course of his general talk Elinton, speaking of the war which was then going badly for the Western allies, "suggested a closer collaboration between American and Soviet scientists. In a more precise manner he asked me to sound you (Oppenheimer) out to see if it would not be possible to exchange data of a technical sort, and he indicated that all preparations had been made to transmit this to the interested parties."

"Today, this might seem to be a dark affair of espionage. But, at the time, not only were the Russians fighting on our side, and not only did the desperate military situation demand exceptional measures, but everyone still recognized the principle that science being universal ought not to encounter any frontier, and precisely could only survive and prosper on the basis of free exchange.

His Reaction

"However, Russia, while not under any duty to tell him that I had enemy country, was still a foreigner and your reaction had indeed been hence to tell Elinton that which we had both expected such an initiative was the affair of the government and not of individuals. Knowing you, I knew that the accounts later given to very well that you would not only S. officials had distorted this reject a proposal of this sort but incidentally out of context and right, but that you would be shocked by it."

"Elinton, I recall, agreed with me completely, and at the time I was well understood living somewhere in London that he would make no practical follow-up to his suggestion."

"I asked myself for some time if I ought to let you know about my conversation with him. I did not want to bother you with that but finally I felt obliged to keep you abreast of things, whatever might have been its importance."

"Consequently, I took advantage of the first opportunity—a meeting of friends which our wives attended—to confide to you the essence of the conversation while you were mixing martinis in the kitchen."

Chevalier recounted that Oppenheimer's response was negative as he had predicted.

"There was nothing to discuss, no decision to take. We were agreed, that was all. There was never any development as far as I was concerned. At my next meeting with Elinton I felt it

<input type="checkbox"/> SAC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S #1
<input type="checkbox"/> ASAC	<input type="checkbox"/> S #2
<input type="checkbox"/> PA	<input type="checkbox"/> S #3
<input type="checkbox"/> C #1	<input type="checkbox"/> TRAIN
<input type="checkbox"/> C #2	<input type="checkbox"/> MA
<input type="checkbox"/> C #3	<input type="checkbox"/> C. CLERK
<input type="checkbox"/> APPL	<input type="checkbox"/> S. STENO

NEWARK EVENING NEWS
Newark, New Jersey

Date 12-2-54 Page 8

SUBMITTED BY THE NEWARK FIELD DIVISION

SEARCHED	INDEXED
SERIALIZED	FILED
DEC 6 1954	
FBI - NEWARK	

100-319368-89

Oppenheimer Says McCarran Act Might Even Have Barred Einstein

NEW YORK, Jan. 3 (AP)—Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer says this: If the McCarran Immigration Act had been in effect at the time, perhaps Dr. Albert Einstein would not have been allowed to enter the United States. Discussing the barring of a

number of foreign scientists on security grounds, Dr. Oppenheimer, one of the chief architects of the atom bomb added:

"This is just terrible, and seems a wholly fantastic and grotesque way to . . . meet the threat of espionage—just an enormous apparatus, surely not well designed for that, and terrible . . . for those of us who live with it."

"We are rightly ashamed by the contempt that the Europeans have for us, and we are rightly embarrassed that we can't hold (scientific) conferences in this country . . . This is a scandal."

Dr. Einstein, famed theoretical physicist, was born in Germany and came to the United States in 1933.

Dr. Oppenheimer, who has been barred from government atomic secrets as a security risk, made the statements in a filmed television interview last night.

Dr. Oppenheimer, director of the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton, N. J., was interviewed at his Princeton office by Edward R. Murrow for his C.B.S. television program "See It Now."

Only a part of the interview touched on the case of Dr. Oppenheimer, who was suspended as a consultant to the Atomic Energy Commission last April, pronounced loyal but still a security risk by a special board in June, and denied access to government secrets by the A.E.C. later in June.

Much of the interview was about the work of the Institute for Advanced Study, where about 100 distinguished scholars work in their various fields.

Mr. Murrow asked Dr. Oppenheimer: "Is there widespread reluctance on the part of scientists to work for the government?"

Dr. Oppenheimer replied: "No, I don't think so. It gets very much distorted when it's talked about in sloganistic terms."

SEARCHED	INDEXED
SERIALIZED	FILED
JAN 10 1955	
FBI - NEWARK	

The Evening Star

<input type="checkbox"/> SAC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S 1
<input type="checkbox"/> ASAC	<input type="checkbox"/> S 12
<input type="checkbox"/> SA	<input type="checkbox"/> S 13
<input type="checkbox"/> C	<input type="checkbox"/> TRACY
<input type="checkbox"/> C #3	<input type="checkbox"/> KA
<input type="checkbox"/> ATCL	<input type="checkbox"/> C. CLARK
	<input type="checkbox"/> S. STENO

DAILY HOME NEWS
NEW BRUNSWICK, N.J.
1-5-55

100-37936B-90